VOLUME 56. JANUARY 1928. NUMBER 1.

Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America

Motto: 1. Cor. 3, 22-23.
Πάντα ὑμῶν ἐστίν, ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ.

Published bi-monthly and entered at the post office at St. Louis, Mo., as second-class matter in December, 1898.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October, 1917, authorized on July 3, 1918.

CONTENTS

Prospectus

of the

Theological Magazine

for

1928

EVANGELICAL SYNOD
OF NORTH AMERICA

Dear brother:

With the beginning of 1927 the Periodical Board decided to give the English first place in our Magazine. Unfortunately some of our German readers resented this change bitterly and quite a few expressed their displeasure by discontinuing the paper. This was greatly to be deplored, especially since there was really no reason for such an outburst of feeling. Every number of last year's output shows that in quality and quantity the German articles were fully on a par with the English. That the "Book Review" and the articles selected from other periodicals (in "The Christian World") were to a greater extent English, was a natural result of circumstances over which we had no control.

The Magazine in 1928 will satisfy all reasonable expectations in the English and German departments.

Our own theological position reflects largely the standpoint of the Synod, we believe. Christ the Saviour stands in the center of our creed and of our faith. Luther's interpretation of the second article we fully adopt. On the basis of this redemption only can we live a Christian life. Christian ethics is the fruit of Christian faith. Many today advise us to turn back from Paul's theology to the "simple (ethical) gospel" of the Synoptics. We have always believed that these advisers were mistaken; they expect to reap where nothing was planted; they think they can learn the Christian "way of life" if they are only shown it. We hold that only the "mystical union" with the crucified and risen Christ gives us the fellowship of his spirit. However, when these essentials are granted, we gladly admit the right of the modern outlook. We test the Bible, the creeds and theologies of the church with all the approved methods of science, without putting our faith for one moment in the keeping of the mere historian. We give to all modern movements an open, though not uncritical, ear.

The modern antipathy to dogmatics and philosophy we can understand but we do not share it. American pragmatism presumes to sneer at metaphysics; modern psychology recognizes no soul, no self, no mind. Ministers need to be grounded in the things that go beyond the bread and butter necessities; else how can they give evidence of the faith that is in them, and how can they lead the blind?

Our Magazine will to the best of our ability be the minister's good friend in qualifying him to be a guide to his flock. Examine the subjects we already announce in this "Prospectus": they are timely, important and useful. Others will follow, in the course of the year, that treat of other vital matters.

Professor Dr. Phil. Vollmer will write on *"the Inspirational Value of Church history"* and on *"the Place of the Social Sciences in the Training of the Modern Minister."*

The *"Revised Catechism"* will probably appear early in 1928. *Professor P. Crusius,* member of the revision committee, will discuss it.

Professor H. Katterjohn will have a paper on *"Youth and the Evangelical Church."*

Rev. H. J. Schick, S.T.M., contributes an article on *"Jonathan Edwards."*

Rev. Armin Haeussler writes on *"Theosophy."*

Professor Dr. John O. Evjen, of the Hamma Divinity School of Wittenberg College, writes on *"Philosophy and Education"* and on *"the Public Ministry."*

Professor Dr. J. L. Neve, of the same institution, will discuss the question, *"Can the United Lutheran Church and the Evangelical Synod unite?"*

Im deutschen Teil machen wir besonders aufmerksam auf **„Die Geschichte der modernen deutschen Theologie,"** die Herr Professor **Dr. R. Grützmacher,** jetzt in Wiesbaden, früher an der Universität Erlangen, in sechs Artikeln behandeln wird, wie folgt: 1. **„Schleiermacher,"** 2. **„Die ältere liberale Theologie,"** 3. **„Die konfessionelle und positive Vermittlungstheologie,"** 4. **„Die Ritschlsche Theologie,"** 5. **„Die religions-geschichtliche Theologie,"** 6. **„Die theologische Lage in der Gegenwart."**

Herr Professor **Dr. W. Baur** schreibt über die sogenannte **„Religion Jesu"** und über **„Die Zukunft unsrer Synode."**

Herr Pastor **Niedernhoefer** liefert eine Diskussion betreffend **„Den alten und den neuen Glauben."**

Herr Pastor **Dr. C. Schieler** schreibt über **„Die Jungfrauengeburt."**

Herr Pastor **G. Schuetze,** S. T. M., behandelt die Frage: **„Sind Bekenntnisse nötig für die Kirche?"**

Herr Pastor **T. Kugler** wird **„Die Wichtigkeit der rechten Stellungnahme zur Zeitlage"** betonen.

In our opinion the coming year of Magazine history has the promise of being one of plenty. We need, however, the cooperation, the warm and loyal friendship of our pastors. We make a hearty appeal to those who left us for "a little while" last year, to come back to the fold. We hope to make many new friends among those who have stood aside so far: May God's blessing rest upon our efforts and make the Magazine an effective agency for the promotion of his cause!

With best wishes and cordial greetings,

I am yours sincerely,

H. Kamphausen, D.D., Editor.

Cleveland, Ohio, December, 1927.

Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per year (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 9807 Cudell Ave., Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-18 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

VOL. 56. ST. LOUIS, MO. JANUARY 1928.

THE INSPIRATIONAL VALUE OF CHURCH HISTORY

By Prof. Philip Vollmer, Ph.D., D.D.

Ministers of the gospel should read church history more than they usually do because of its many-sided values. The study of general, denominational and local church history, as well as biographies, leads to a truer appreciation of the past, to the better understanding of present conditions, and thus enables a clearer outlook to the future. It broadens the mind, contributes to general culture and inspires heart and will to work with stronger enthusiasm for Christ and His church. This essay is limited to the consideration of the *inspirational value* of the study of the various phases of church history.

God in History

A thorough study of Church history in the first place, inspires the student with a larger measure of faith that God is in history. "History," said the German philosopher Hegel, "is the evolution of the absolute spirit and hence supremely rational throughout." While Hegel's system, as a whole, is dangerously near to pantheism and fatalism in that it regards the individual as the blind organ of the world spirit, yet the foregoing dictum expresses correctly the Christian conception of history. It satisfies the scientific instinct for unity of plan which we discern in history as it interlaces the ages. In the records of the past we perceive a perfect and boundless wisdom pervading the history of the world in all its periods,

minutely caring for what is obscurest and smallest and feeblest, sublimely comprehending what is largest and grandest and strongest. We discern a power which, alike without haste and without rest, moves on in its noiseless path unhindered and unchallenged from age to age, melting when it will, with sunlight, smiting when it will, with lightning. Best of all, we discern a love which has opened itself to man like the unfolding of the heavenly gates, sending forth the Son of God to reclaim a lost world. God's providence is, however, not in all cases, visible to the naked eye of fallible men. Sometimes His footsteps are indeed plain as daylight, but very often He moves in a mysterious way His wonders to perform; yet He is always there and His presence is constantly felt. The distinction of the world's history into sacred and profane may do for the purpose of classification in text-books, but strictly speaking, profane history, which according to the etymology of the word, would be history without God in it, is impossible. In Him we live and move and have our being. To exclude God from history is to thrust out its eyes and tear the living heart from its bosom. It would make its annals a tangled web of human folly, a subjective play of human passions and intrigue, without any guiding principle or certain aim, a lawless play of caprice without any unity as the basis of the manifold, an unspeakably dreary thing, void of all inspiration. This is not the Christian conception of history. To us the whole history of the world is, as St. Augustine in his "City of God" describes it, the "unfolding of the Kingdom of God." God is even concerned with those portions of history in which the power of evil is displayed. In his infinite wisdom he brings out good from evil and turns the plans and purposes of his foes to the benefit of his children, as Geibel says:

"Seines Rathes heil'gen Schluessen,
Auch die Boesen dienen muessen,
Wenn sie thun nach ihrer Lust."

What is true of history in general must be particularly emphasized of that branch of history which traces the rise and progress of the Kingdom of God upon earth. In Church history the reader is ushered into the immediate presence of the Head of the Church. Through it he learns that "God is in the midst of her." "In the midst of the seven candle-sticks there is one like unto the Son of Man." (Rev. 1: 13). Everywhere in church history we discern traces of Divine footsteps, attesting the fulfillment of the promise, "Lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." The annals of the church are one long, practical, commentary on the character, the ways and the eternal purpose of God, and being such,

they are intensely inspiring to the devout student. How vividly do they illustrate God's wisdom and Goodness and mercy! What solemn display does history furnish of divine justice! While due homage is to be paid to the leading actors in history, the master hand that guided them must not be overlooked. Not man's power but Divine wisdom made modern times.

Time fails me adequately to illustrate these principles by examples from the rich storehouse of church history, all pointing in the one direction that God is in history as its inspiring force. How plainly, for example, can we see the hand of God in the two pre-Christian centuries, when he prepared the world for the spread of the Gospel by scattering thousands of Jews throughout the Roman Empire to make known a higher and purer conception of God as well as by the spread of the Greek language and culture throughout the known world. How clearly can we read God's thoughts in guiding Columbus to discover America, and yet keeping him from North America, thus preventing the colonization of this part of our country by Catholic Spain and Portugal, and reserving it for a haven of refuge when the persecuted Protestants of Europe should require one. And this came to pass by providential intervention of God. Guided by a chart which Tuscanelli, a Florentine astronomer, had prepared for him, Columbus passed the Canaries and would have reached the coast of our southern states, had he not been persuaded by one of his companions to turn to the southwest, in the direction which a flock of pigeons was observed to take. But for this sudden change in the discoveror's course, the descendants of Spanish Roman Catholics might now inhabit our Atlantic seaboard. And is not God's providence truly adorable in making use even of the follies and ambitions of emperors, kings, princes and nobles in the Reformation period, thus preventing the concentration of these powers against Protestantism at a time when the movement was still too weak to withstand a concerted onslaught?

Thus viewed, Church History should be for the teacher of religion a study of the first interest, a fountain of the richest spiritual enjoyment and instruction, an interpretation of the conflict between human passion and divine law in our own times, and the best interpretation of the ways of God, by showing that

"Deep in unfathomable mines,
Of never failing skill,
He treasures up His bright designs,
And works His sovereign will."

Church History Inspires Love for the Search of Truth

The study of Church History and especially that part which traces the development of Christian doctrine is well calculated to inspire the devout student with a deep admiration for the strenuous efforts made by many leaders of the church to arrive at the truth, though we as Protestants and modern thinkers may feel bound to reject many of the conclusions they arrived at. The theology of the church has a history as clearly defined as any other. We find in it a gradual subjective development of Christian truth, as crystallized in dogmas, creeds and complete systems of theology. The Lord expressly prepared the church for just such advance when he said, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot hear them now. When the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all truth." There is a constant, though sometimes interrupted advance in the church's assimilation of truth, yet not unmixed with grave errors in some sections. For the progress of the church may be compared to a mountain path which leads the traveler to the summit, not indeed by a straight road, but in a zigzag line. The summit of truth never lies in the extremes to which in the heat of controversy its champions are driven, but in the middle or rather in the depth. The reader of Church history will learn that the symbols of our faith have not always been precisely what they are today. The Council of Constantinople, for example, went farther than that of Nice, and those of Ephesus and Chalcedon went farther still Later followed the numerous creeds of Protestantism. Nor dare we say that the theology of Christendom is yet complete. While the great doctrines of the Trinity Atonement, Sin, Grace, Justification, etc., have been discussed to the last refinement of logic, so that nothing new of any moment can probably ever be said concerning them, yet better statements even of these fundamental doctrines of our creeds are possible. Many modern thinkers, through the study of church history, are being inspired to work out a new theology for the old faith.

In speaking of progressive development, we do not mean an advance beyond Chirst as he is revealed in the Scriptures, but rather a fuller appreciation of Him who said "I am the truth." The evangelical conception of historical development clearly distinguishes between truth as objectively present in Christ and in the Scriptures, and truth as subjectively present in the consciousness of the Church. Christianity in itself and objectively considered is complete in Christ in whom dwells the fulness of the Godhead bodily and who is the same yesterday, today and forever, and is recorded in the New Testament in its normative form for all time; but subjectively, Christianity, or the life of the God-man in his

Church, is a process of development from the lower to the higher. Nothing, however, can be developed unless it is contained potentially in the germ. A doctrine which has no root in the Scriptures, that is, a doctrine that is not expressed in any Scriptural passage, and is not contained in any Scriptural principle, and is not implied in any Scriptural narrative, parable, event or character, and is not by any natural inference and association of thought, suggested by any Scriptural language" such a doctrine ought never to be developed as a part of the faith of the Church.

By showing the great errors in the theological development of the past, the study of church history will guard the reader against an overvaluation of tradition and of the creeds of Christendom. The present has too often been the willing victim of the past, but a careful study of church history will enable and inspire the intelligent minister to exploit the past in the interest of advance. The work of the searcher after truth in the past should appeal to us moderns, saying, "Go and do likewise! Prove all things and hold fast to that which is true." For blind acception of traditions involves great perils. It is common to attach the greatest weight to the oldest opinion. Yet it is not correct to look for the highest wisdom in antiquity; because, as Bacon reminds us, *we are the ancients* and they who lived before us belonged to the childhood of the race. On the other hand, ideas that have stood the test of time win a certain guarantee of their solidity in comparison with raw notions, suddenly springing from the imagination of a new thinker. But that is only the case when those ideas are being constantly tested by experience and criticism; and it does not apply after tradition has become petrified and has attained the rank of a venerated idol. Tradition sometimes claims to be of divine origin, handed down in the Church from the time of the Apostles in a line of authorized teachers. The extravagant pretensions of Romanism, founded on the authority of tradition which the Council of Trent declared to be of equal value with that of Scripture, warn us against the danger of trusting such claims. Tradition may become an excuse for unfaithfulness to Divine revelation. Thus it was with the Jews, and is now with the Romanists and others.

Church History Inspires Interest in Church Union

We are living in an atmosphere of Church union, as the continuous negotiations and especially the great conferences at Stockholm and Lausanne, indicate. These union movements will be clarified and strengthened by the study of Church history, as it will inform the reader how disunion arose and where the right path to reunion lies. It will thus inspire a larger number of leading

churchmen with a stronger desire to do their bit in healing the wounds of a divided church by employing the most effective methods.

Church history reminds us that already in the Apostolic age there were various types of Christian teaching. Paul, James, Peter and John discussed their doctrinal differences and often clashed very vigorously. (Gal. 2 and Acts 15); but none of the groups, except the intolerant ultra-conservative Judaizers, demanded that the brother holding another viewpoint should be cast out from the church. They believed in an inclusive, comprehensive church.

Church history further shows how in the course of centuries the plain gospel of Christ was overlaid and burdened with the philosophies, sophistries and unintelligible disputes on the unfathomable mysteries of God's nature, in utter disregard of Paul's warning (Rom. 11: 33-36). Very soon not the plain simple Gospel of Christ, but these subtleties were emphasized and made the test of orthodoxy, and the dissenters were excommunicated on the charge of heresy. *Thus disunion and new churches arose,* like the Armenian, the Nestorian, the Coptic and other communions. Later the pope insisted on the highly speculative doctrine that the Holy Spirit proceeded not only from the Father but also from the Son ("filioque") which drove the Greek Catholic Church into separation. At the conference of Marburg in 1529 Luther and Zwingli agreed on 14½ of the 15 articles of their common Protestant faith, drawn up by Luther himself, and only on the second half of the fifteenth article concerning the mode and manner of Christ's presence in the Lord's supper they disagreed, whether it is physical (Luther) or spiritual (Zwingli) and because of this slight difference Luther refused to Zwingli the hand of fellowship, and his refusal led to the formation of the Reformed churches. Similarly in Great Britain, the Church of England insisted on the apostolic succession of their bishops, and their stubbornness finally led to the threefold division into Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Episcopalians. Still more trivial differences were the causes of the more than 150 American denominations.

But Church history also shows plainly that the way to church union lies along the lines of toleration and freedom within the churches, by soft pedaling the differences and by emphasizing the true fundamentals taught by Christ, such as living faith in God, loyalty to Christ, personal and social regeneration, universal brotherhood, the abolishment of many still existing relics of barbarism, such as war and poverty. History shows that all church unions which in the past have come about succeeded on the basis of tolera-

tion, freedom, inclusiveness and comprehensiveness, which basis long ago was succinctly expressed by St. Augustine, when he advised:

"In necessaries unitas,
In dubiis libertas,
In omnibus caritas."

For example, in 1817 the Lutheran and Reformed Churches in Prussia formed a *federated* union on the basis of liberty of belief concerning their distinctive doctrines; in 1818 these two denominations in the Palatinate (Pfalz), Baden and Hesse went still further than in Prussia and formed a *complete consensus of merging and absorptive union,* dropping even the old names, and assuming the official title: "The United Evangelical Church." Of this type of union, not of that in Prussia, our Evangelical Synod is the daughter. At present, the principle of toleration ("Gleichberechtigung der Richtungen") is fully practiced in England, Germany, Switzerland and almost all other European Churches. High, low and broad churchmen, Lutherans and Reformed, liberals and conservatives of various shades are members of one and the same synod and teach side by side in the theological faculties, not indeed in unrestrained liberty but in the spirit of wide tolerance. These different groups do indeed discuss very frankly their differences in private conferences, in numerous periodicals and even on the floor of their official synods, but very seldom is the demand heard that this or that group should be cast out of the official church. Almost all their leaders stand for a comprehensive, inclusive church, strongly believing that in the long run and with liberty of research guaranteed Christ's spirit will step by step lead His loyal followers into clearer truth. They all seem to believe in Voltaire's oft-quoted definition of toleration: "I don't believe a word of what you say, but I will defend to the last your right to say it."

Intolerance and the principle of an exclusive church breeds either discreet silence which withholds some of the best ideas from the people for fear of heresy hunting, or it leads to rebellion and more sects. It is hopeless and the height of folly to pretend to bring all men to have the same thoughts on speculations regarding the deep mysteries of religion, or to accept Episcopal Church government or to practice immersion. It is not in human nature of large groups of men, especially of the educated classes, to agree long on theological definitions. Theology is philosophy and it is characteristic of all philosophies that they are subject to great changes in the course of time. A final theology is not any more possible than a final science, or a final law or a final medicine. It

is in the very nature of the human mind to push on to further fields of inquiry. In his time Paul was considered a "new" theologian, so later was Luther.

Christian saving faith is happily a very simple matter, and is, and ever will be, outside of all theological disputes of men learned or unlearned. True faith can be secured only by living the Christ life and by earnest prayer. It is not mere belief opinion or credulity. Let us reverence the old creeds as way-marks of progress and use selected portions of them as material for the new edifice of the theological intellect, but never as stumbling blocks in the path of those who feel to say "Sirs we would see Jesus." If not all signs deceive, the spirit of union between and within most American denominations is growing. If it were not so, we would see new sects formed every year. There are enough differences of opinion within the Presbyterian, the Evangelical, the Methodist and other churches to divide each one into two or more new denominations, and the only thing that keeps them knit together is the spirit of tolerance. When in recent years the militant wing of the fundamentalists tried to force a separation within the Presbyterian and the Baptist churches, the majority, composed of liberals and conservatives, formed a *tolerationist group* and called a halt of strife on the plea that futile controversies divert the energies of faith to a deplorable degree from their real task which is saving souls. This summer's theological Union Seminary Conference broke all records for attendance. From 29 states came 298 pastors and religious workers, owing allegience to 18 denominations and representing 66 theological seminaries. Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationalists, Baptists, Lutherans, Episcopalians and so on down the line to the Friends, Methodist Protestant, Unitarian and Hebrew. Seminaries represented were Union, Lancaster, Yale, Gettysburg, Princeton, Auburn, McCormick, Boston and Drew. A new feature was the presence of fifteen colored pastors. This shows the strength of toleration and union.

The union movement within and between denominations expects much help from our lay people. Most of them, as well as a large number of ministers, feel that in spirit and in the real fundamentals "we are not divided; all one body we, one in hope and doctrine, one in charity." Our clear-headed lay people observe that various denominations already worship and work together occasionally, in innumerable federations and union services and they wonder why this cannot be done permanently. An increasing number of business men who pay the bills of the church's extravagance also insist that the present waste in men and money and equipment should be stopped. As one said recently "Every denomination to-

day laments the dearth of its resources both of money and men. What right then have we to waste such resources as we have by expending them where they are not really needed instead of where they are. The immediate demand is not for more surveys—there have been enough of them to convince the most skeptical that in the location of our churches the various sects have been bereft of any common plan and so have drifted into an inefficiency which a business firm would never tolerate."

Pressure from without may also help in unifying the Churches. Count Hermann Keyserling has recently assured us that we stand on the threshold of the most irreligious, indeed the most anti-religious epoch of all times. We have heard much of assaults upon Christianity in Russia and China; and we must recognize an aggressive anti-Christian movement in our own country. On every university campus there are professors and students who consider the Christian faith incredible, and who lose no opportunity to pour sneering contempt upon it as a belated survival of crude superstition to be laughed out of existence as an affront to intelligence. Some magazines and publishing houses whose clientele is composed of the self-styled intelligentsia, adopt a similar attitude and carry on an insidious propaganda against Christian morality. In most communities there are groups of socially minded men and women who have come to feel that not only organized Christianity but the faith of Jesus Himself is inimical to human progress. Moreover, a strong socialistic political party will soon be due in America, whether we like it or not, and this fact also demands a united church.

Church History Inspires Love for the Social Gospel

The phrase "social gospel" is new, but not the idea for which the phrase stands. "It is a valid idea, discovered or rediscovered almost in our own time and deserving of an emphasis proportionate to the neglect which it had suffered through the preceding ages. No other phrase carries that idea so well. The implications of the idea are only beginning to be unfolded. Most of its meaning is yet to be learned. Yet there are those who curl the lip in high disdain when it is mentioned, and affect an utter weariness with a term so often reiterated. The reason is quite patent. They do not believe in the social gospel and they would discredit it by discrediting its vocabulary. If you believe that the attempt to Christianize the social order is an impertinent interference with a divinely approved status quo, or an illegitimate digression from the task of saving souls, then you will easily grow tired of hearing others speak of the social gospel, and you can fortify your hostility

to the conception which it represents by speaking scornfully, as a so-called religious paper did not so long ago, of the social gospel and such chop suey." (Christian Century.)

Beginning with Christ and His apostles, the Church has never entirely neglected her duty to fashion the world according to the social principles of Jesus, though she may often have used false methods. The Roman government persecuted the Church, not because she confessed the divine sonship of Jesus (they themselves believed in many "sons of their gods") but because the Christians insisted that Jesus was their king whose teachings should rule the Roman empire. They were pacifists on principle; they raised the standard of women, children and slaves. The forming of the Holy Roman Empire in 800 A. D. by the pope was meant to be an institution for Christianizing the social order. All the Protestant reformers even Luther, were also *social* reformers, besides their distinctively religious work. The Protestant churches of England, Germany, Switzerland and America have to their credit hosts of men and women whose life was devoted to the amelioration of social conditions like Maurice, Carlyle, Ruskin, Kingsley, Stoecker, Naumann, Shaftesbury, von Bodelschwingh, Wichern, and many others. The reading of biographies of these men will prove a tonic and will most assuredly inspire a minister to follow in their train, according to the talents received of God.

All the churches, Protestant, Catholic and Jewish, are today engaged in a tremendous and unprecedented effort to better themselves as well as society, by advance in religious education, in moral earnestness and in prophetic vision. Since Walter Rauschenbusch twenty years ago stirred up the American churches on matters of the social gospel some decided progress has been made. The literature which has developed on the relation of Christian idealism to the problems of economic and political life is voluminous. "The number of religious leaders, both clerical and lay, who have some understanding of what Christianity ought to mean in economic and social terms has been greatly increased. Institutional church, activities, if they have anything to do with the subject, have been multiplied. In problems of international morality the gain is obvious. The church has learned a lesson or two from the war. Whether or not the church is ready for heroism, should another war come, is matter for dispute; but it could not possibly be as naive as it was in the last one." (Christian Century.) All the churches have appointed social commission to keep their people informed and socially inspired. Yes, we are making some progress in recouping the losses suffered by Christian idealism centuries ago and so brilliantly analyzed by Professor Jawney in his "Religion

and the Rise of Capitalism." The very fact that there is an increasing opposition to this phase of church work on the part of the wealthy, the ultra conservative and the mis- or uniformed within and without the churches proves that the social gospel leaven is working.

Church History Furnishes Devotional and Homiletical Inspiration

The study of Church history, lastly, inspires the reader with increased devotion and consecration to Christ and his Church by bringing Him into living contact with the great men and women who in all ages have prayed and labored and sacrificed and suffered and died for the Master and his cause. They are still above us and about us, a dense cloud of witnesses, in view of whom we are exhorted to run with patience the race that is before us. History says Carlyle "is but the biography of great men." Behind every gigantic movement there is a great mind and a stout heart. The biographies of the great men introduce us into those retreats of private life where the thoughts which have ruled the world were born and developed. They also emphasize anew that the *religious life in the form of subjective piety* is the measure of the true church. The most truth is found where we have the largest amount of practical piety. We need the help of these glorified spirits; not the help of their intercessions, but the help of their example, treasured for us in the volumes of Church history to inspire us. We need them all. Not Luther or Zwingli or Calvin only, but St. Bernard and Anselm of the Middle Ages and Polycarp and St. Augustine, the saints of ancient times who had each his own word to say, his own work to do, his own battle to wage, his own victory to win; Roman saints as well as Protestant and Greek as well as Roman; out of the catacombs, the deserts, the monasteries. Wherever in any century, in any land or in any denomination there beats a heart, or is lifted a hand for Christ, let us grasp that hand, let us bless that heart. Such ample charity while it makes us none the less Protestant, will surely make us all the more Christian.

Lives of great men all remind us
  We can make our lives sublime,
And departing leave behind us,
  Footprints on the sands of time.

Footprints that perhaps another,
  Sailing o'er life's solemn main,
A forlorn and shipwrecked brother,
  Seeing, shall take heart again.

Picture to yourself the scene when the old Bishop Polycarp immediately before his martyrdom said: "Eighty-six years have I served the Lord, and He has done me nothing but good; how could I curse him who has redeemed me?" Or the scene at Worms, when Luther, with death staring him in the face declared: "Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise; God help me." Or the defense of the Heidelberg catechism before the Emperor by the Elector Frederick of the Pfalz, when he said that he would rather give up his throne than his catechism. Or the landing of the Pilgrim fathers in 1620, or the founding of Germantown by the Germans in 1683. These are telling sermon illustrations. Cold indeed and insensible, must be the student who can read these stories without being mightily aroused to emulation and powerfully inspired to greater devotion and consecration, and whose lips do not quiver with the prayer "More love to thee, O Christ, more love to thee."

Selected Bibliography

Among the many books on the foregoing subject we recommend the following:

Schaff's Church History.
Oehninger, Geschichte des Christentums.
Geschichte des Religioesen Lebens in der Deutschen Evangelischen Synode von Nord Amerika, by H. Kamphausen.
The Reformation a Liberating Force, by Philip Vollmer.
Geschichte der Evang. Synode, by Dr. Muecke.
Biographies of Luther, by P. Smith and by McGiffert.
Biographies of Calvin, by Walker and by Philip Vollmer.
Biography of Zwingli, by Jackson.
A Vital Problem of American Protestantism, by J. H. Horstmann.

PHILOSOPHY AND EDUCATION

Prof. John O. Evjen, Ph. D.

(*Concluded*)

Reciprocity of Education and Philosophy

It is unnecessary to continue our historical survey further. The influence of philosophy on education is evident everywhere. Philosophy gives, education received. And yet, philosophy would be the possession of only a few, if education did not apply its ideas concretely. Philosophy, therefore, in its turn, is indebted to education. However, since philosophy no longer retains its autocratic leadership of yore, there are now not a few educators who wish to give the leadership formerly enjoyed by philosophy over to education. Their program is to make education the center of all study. But this is fundamentally wrong. For, in the first place philosophy is stronger today than it was when it played the role of a dictator. Today it is a leader in a democracy of sciences. Formerly it was Monarch pure and simple. There is no real philosophy without science, and no science without philosophy. In the second place, education is practical. If it becomes pure theory, it will defeat its own end. Thirdly, there have been many prominent educators who have never studied pedagogy or "education" as a special discipline. Fourthly, the interest in pedagogy grows with teaching; yes, it may happen that it does not awake before one begins to teach. And lastly, it is admitted that pedagogy and didactics do not accomplish for the future teacher, even in a remote degree, what the clinical sciences do for the future physician and surgeon.

The attempt to establish an "education" aristocracy is based upon a superficial knowledge of philosophy, especially of its history, and upon a rather limited knowledge of the functions of the special sciences.

Education, instead of being on the way to a generalship, is heading, it would appear for a sergeantship, judging by much of what is passed off as education today. To borrow another figure, it is probably not too much said that we have a dangerously good supply of jazz education on the market, an uncomfortably large number of hodgepodge electives served in chautauqua style to very immature personalities. Education certainly cannot accomplish even what it did in the past, if it does not build more upon philosophy than it is doing at the present time. In fact, we are inviting Anarchy in our education, if we do not pause in our wild chase to read the signs on the road.

The Aim of Philosophy

In its nigh omnipotent days, in the days of Aristotle, philosophy covered physics, cosmology, zoology, metaphysics, ethics, psychology, politics, economics, rhetoric, poetics. Not so now. And happily, and wisely so. Its mission today is not of the extensive, but of the intensive order.

Spencer has given an interesting definition of philosophy: "Knowledge of the lowest kind," he says, "is un-unified knowledge; science is partially-unified knowledge; philosophy is completely unified knowledge." Wundt defines philosophy as the unification of all knowledge obtained by the special sciences in a consistent whole. Philosophy is also defined as the critical science of general value judgments. Külpe's definition appeals to me as the best: "Philosophy is the science of the most general principles of being, becoming, possibility, actuality, necessity." Every science speaks of conditions, laws, forces, possibilities, realities; but no single discipline can undertake a comprehensive discussion of these and similar terms. This is the business of philosophy.

The purpose, then, of philosophy is evident. It is to gain a general world and life view, which answers to the demands of our reason, and satisfies the needs of our feelings (Wundt). Therefore, that which is *general* is the object of philosophy; as the *special* is the object of history; and the *typical,* or what recures regularly or according to laws, is the object of natural science.

Man needs a philosophy. He does not live by science alone, anymore than by bread alone. He feels the need of poetry and art, of faith and religion. Besides knowledge, he wants what is soothing, what expresses itself in color and form, in music and rhythm. His feelings as well as his intellect have their needs. He feels the need of faith in himself, in his undertaking, in his people, in the future of the human race, in the final victory of the good; and he feels the need of religion—of God.

But even if he has religion, and aesthetics, and sciences, he still feels the need to reason about them and to unite them in a world view that satisfies his intellect and his heart. He needs the science of sciences, that is the systematization of sciences, whether natural-scientific, or intelectual, or moral: He needs philosophy, this science of sciences.

Every science claims a part of reality. Geometry assumes that there is space, but it leaves with philosophy the task of finding out whether there is real space, or whether space is a mere auxiliary concept. An illustration: Physics considers reality in so far as it is corporal, showing general modes and relations. Biology con-

siders processes of life in the same matter. Psychology considers this matter from another side: in so far as it is consciousness per se. But philosophy unifies all of these in order to answer the question, "What is reality?" The special sciences offer partial solutions. But philosophy, on the basis of these partial solutions, can alone give the ultimate solution. The unity that philosophy is striving to attain is a necessary thought. This is evident from the fact that all sciences have to deal with psychology and epistemology.

Philosophy, then, is dependent on all the sciences, of whatever nature they may be. And the sciences again are dependent on philosophy. Any denial of this will invite the retelling of Menenius Agrippa's story about the rebellion that the members of the human body started against the stomach as the lazy devourer of nourishment, a rebellion ending in self-defeat. It makes little difference whether philosophy is compared to a head or a stomach, a heart or a root. The comparisons, all alike, serve to show that science apart from philosophy is bound to perish. The same holds true of education. Its separation from philosophy means selfdestruction.

Fr. Paulsen has well compared philosophy to a central fire, to the sun whose life-giving, warming rays go forth to all of the sciences. A field of research is cultivatable only to the extent that it is penetrated by these rays. Anyone who digs in the ground independent of the sun's rays will harvest hard fruit, if fruit at all. A science, without contact with philosophy, will shoot forth plants of the kind that grows where no sun shines. Or to change the illustration, a system of science without philosophy is one-eyed, a Cyclops, huge and deformed, with the chances of losing whatever vision it has at the hands of a crafty Ulysses, who is bent on leaving unknown regions for better known ones.

The Antecedents of Philosophers

A philosopher cannot be a down-to-date authority in every field of science, though we have a remarkable example in Wilhelm Wundt, reminding us of the polyhistor ability of an Aristotle and a Leibniz. Wundt was at home in all of the sciences, and, as Höffding has said, "the most learned philosopher of our age." A philosopher may be a theologian, like Höffding or Heinze; or a physiologist, like Wundt or James; a physicist, like Mach; a jurist, like Leibniz or Bentham; or an economist, like John Stuart Mill. In any case he will have his feet on the ground, and not be a dreamer, lost in unreal abstractions. "All roads lead to Rome," is an old saying. All roads of science, likewise, lead to philosophy, but none through the air.

Scientific Opinions Under Revision

Philosophy, depending on the sciences, and yet claiming a dependence of its own, is especially welcome in our present age, when natural science is losing some of the philosophic sufficiency which it has been showing the last two generations. Natural science has begun to question some of the results which it long ago stamped as unchangeable and infallible. We are now told by some of the leading scientists of the world that it is just as scientific to teach that the earth stands and the sun moves, as it is to teach that the sun stands and the earth moves; in other words, that the old Ptolmaeic system is as scientifically good as the Copernican; the relativity theory compelling us to arrive at this conclusion. We are told again that the alchemists, whom the chemists and ourselves have repeatedly laughed at, were right in their theory that gold is not an element, but that they were wrong in their practice. We are further told that the same and four scores of elements that we know are probably reducible to one element; that radium changes into lead, and that lead in the course of the milleniums may turn into gold. We are no longer sure of gravitation, since Einstein told the world that a stone let go from an elevation does not fall, but remains still, being overtaken by the upwards rising earth. We are no longer sure about the existence of ether, time and space, causality, atoms and molecules. We are no longer sure that we have an infinite universe. We are no longer certain that five miles below the crust of our earth is a burning mass. In fact, we are now told that the earth is likely a solid, cold magnet ball, covered by a crust fifteen to twenty miles deep. Below this crust is a layer of fire liquid, 800 miles deep. We are no longer sure that Eucledian geometry is absolutely correct, when we hear that there is no such a thing as parallel lines, all parallel lines in this great universe of ours finally running into each other. We have dogmatism in natural sciences too. But this dogmatism is being assailed today as never before.

Metaphysical Questions

But these matters do not worry us. Questions of greater importance, answerable by metaphyciss, are the following: What is life, and what is the purpose of life? What relation have the psychical processes with the physical, especially with the brain processes that accompany them? Is earthly existence the only existence, or is there an existence beyond, as held by religion? Are the moral tasks that we assign ourselves and endeavor to realize, only of subjective importance, or is the world so disposed as to have them realized? Is there progress in historical development in the sense of growth and expansion of spiritual and human values?

Many do not concern themselves about these questions. Some are resigned, or do not care. Some are callous, or well satisfied with any authoritative answer. But some want to find the answer, and to pass it on to their fellow men. These are the metaphysicians, which that school of philosophy known as Positivism ignores, not caring for spiritual realities given in religion or anything transcendental.

Metaphysics, therefore, has some strong enemies to cope with. The attitude towards logic and epistemology is more friendly. For, logic investigates the laws of thought; epistemology investigates the nature and origin, the validity and limits of knowledge; and every science must examine its presuppositions and proceed according to laws of reasoning. The importance of epistemology and logic is therefore very evident.

Ethics and aesthetics receive a less friendly reception than do logic and epistemology. But they are not quite as much scoffed at as metaphysics.

Phychology has an established position in education that few will dispute, though it is only a matter of time when it will be rivaled by ethics and history of culture (Volkelt).

Since logic treats of Knowledge; metaphysics of Being; ethics of What-Ought-To-Be in the field of morality; and aesthetics of the laws of art, the value of philosophy for education appears self-evident—even apart from psychology. Or, to put it differently: Any educational program that stresses what is beautiful, true, and good cannot operate unless it accepts the help offered by the systematized knowledge we have in aesethetics, which treats of the beautiful; in logic which treats of the true; and in ethics which treats of the good.

I therefore maintain that the importance of philosophy for education should not be underestimated. And here I mean education in both its restricted sense, and liberal sense. Education in its liberal sense is more comprehensive than the education that a state teachers' association devotes most of its time to. This education at best hardly gets beyond the simpler problems of secondary education. Education in the larger, and really true, sense includes more than what the normal school loves to call "educational" or "professional" subjects, meaning methods, reviews, school management, practice teaching, psychology, etc. It is possible that a Harvard, Yale or Cornell alumnus, a graduate of both the undergraduate and graduate department, drifting into a normal school, may be asked how much education he has had, and be told he "has not had any education."

By education I mean the whole of education, and not a part

or phase of it. I do not identify it with the work given in the grades, or in the secondary schools, or in the normal, or even in college. I include all of this, and more. And yet I wish to emphasize that professors of education are the very people that most of all need a thorough grounding in philosophy. Many of our fads and freaks in graded school work, many of our ill-balanced curricula, much of our uniformity mania, many of our methods, savoring of license as well as the straight-jacket, ever so much of our intolerable dogmatism—hail from, or are sponsored by, professors of education, and are passed along by less mature disciples. Education has witnessed many a romantic adventure. No sooner is a man through college then he aspires for an administrative position in a high school and gets it. He has practically no knowledge of philosophy, and has had no training in a positive science like Law, Medicine or Theology, nor has he done any other graduate work. He is a theorist. If he has gotten his B.A. in the school of education, he is still a theorist, only so much more so than if he had taken his 130 semester hours in straight college work. The sudden and overwhelming enthusiasm we have lately witnessed for mental tests shows what the educationist is apt to do when his education has no roots in philosophy, or is not supported by any education derived from such old, well-developed, positive subjects as Law, Medicine or Theology. An educationist is too often like the evergreen used as a Christmas tree. This tree parades its fruits, many kinds; its sweets; its colors; it may even radiate light. But the fruits and sweets, colors and lights are borrowed; and the tree has no roots. This is the danger: the glory soon passes away.

I have had books in my hand written by professors in education—books whose authors have reminded me of the Christmas tree. One author discusses church, religion and theology. His knowledge of the subject is not first hand, hardly third hand. He has read a few books from a "liberal" camp and settles some of the most profound problems with a few sweeps of his pen. Another discusses evolution, and applies biologic evolution to man and history—where many a biologist and historian of repute would write with moderation or at least maintain a very sceptical attitude. The author I have in mind is neither a biologist nor a historian. One has "education's latest results" on hygiene, when these "latest results" may be the hypotheses of a little school which the history of medicine has shown up as exploded, generations ago. One writes on the little value of knowing foreign or classical languages, when it is apparent that he has no command of any other language than his own. One discusses law, but the well educated jurist that reads his work, shakes his head.

The educationist cannot be an expert in all branches of knowledge. Only a few educationists have had a training in medicine, as William James, Maria Montessori, Walter F. Dearborn; in Law, Alexis E. Frye, Thomas Edward Finnegan; in Theology, as A. E. Winship, George A. Coe, E. Stanley Hall, Fletcher H. Swift—and a host of foreign educators, like Wilhelm Rein, editor of the largest Encyclopedia of Education in existence; Ernst M. Roloff, editor of the most recent Encyclopedia of Education, "Lexikon der Pädagogik," in five volumes, from Catholic point of view; Ernst Meumann. But many have had—most of those mentioned above—training in philosophy, and will testify to the help they have derived from this study in their educational work. Philosophy, more than any other study, shows the interrelationship of the various branches of study, how much or how little they overlap, and the place each study has in the whole field of knowledge. It is the science of, or, perhaps better, the science *about* sciences.

The History of Teaching Philosophy

Philosophy was the concluding study of school studies until the beginning of last century, being given as propaedeutics in all colleges. Then it became a university study, attracting a lesser number of students, who were too busy with their professional studies to reason out a theory of life. It lost its prestige, and became simply a science among other sciences. Kant's system was too critical to become a school system. Then the speculative systems came, one after the other sweeping over Europe, in rapid succession, each one proclaiming war upon all of the others. This meant the falling of philosophy into disrepute. In the fifties and sixties of the last century, natural science laughing at philosophy, proudly proclaimed its system of materialism and atheism. Natural science had of course made a big headway in the practical realm, but it overstepped its boundaries when it proclaimed itself an absolute Monarch.

Something of this spirit of absolutism was manifested recently when an American association working for the advancement of science and claiming a membership of 11,000, publicly proclaimed evolution as a dogma, possibly as a rebuke to Mr. Bryan, whose arguments on evolution, it is true, have no more real weight than that of any other man, but whose challenge to evolution has a little in common with that of Professor Hans Driesch, one of our greatest present day authorities on biology and philosophy. Driesch delivered the Gifford lectures in the University of Aberdeen, Scotland, in 1907 and 1908. They were published in English; in 1921 they were revised and published under the title of

"Philosophie des Organischen," a large volume of more than 600 pages. Dr. Driesch, recently caled to the University of Leipzig to succeed W. Wundt, subjects evolution to a very sceptical treatment. Somewhere he has endorsed the saying that the evolutionist's genealogical table of man is as trustworthy as the genealogy of the Homeric Gods!

A society of 11,000 members, a great many of whom probably can claim the distinction of being scientists with no better right than a nurse can claim the distinction of being a physician, or a midwife a surgeon, has actually immitated, by going on record, the ancient ecclesiastic councils in proclaiming a dogma. This society may number some who have mocked the council that proclaimed papal infallibility. And yet what does it, itself, proclaim but a dogma: Evolutionistic infallibility?

No: evolution stands or falls before the bar of philosophy, the science of sciences, where also a thinker and expert like Driesch, thoroughly at home in biology and philosophy, has a right to be heard. Natural science is only one witness, not the entire court.

The Age of Reconstruction

We are living today in the period of philosophic reconstruction. Sciences have again learned the value of philosophy, and are themselves becoming increasingly philosophic. We notice it especially in the field of biology. However, philosophy needs a better support than we are giving it at present in order to make it safeguard our youth, who too often fall into the hands of the first best sophist that comes along with his alleged discoveries that have been exploded centuries before and discarded by philosophy, of which he is quite ignorant. It does, therefore, not surprise us that leading educators wish to have propaedeutic philosophy taught—and taught early, yes as early as in the freshman class in college (Thilly of Cornell, Woodworth of Columbia).

Teaching Philosophy in a Practical Way

Even where philosophy is not taught as a school subject, much can be done to show the young people, by giving one hour talks on the fundamental thoughts of leading philosophers, that there have been really great men who retained world views differing much from those that are sanctioned by the socalled common sense today. I think of a Plato, a Democritus, an Aristotle, a Descartes, a Spinoza, a Hume, a Leibzig, a Kant, a Fechner, a Bergson. A few hours of instruction in regard to these men would convey to students the difference between the metaphysical categories of materialism and idealism, illustrated by the thinking of Democritus and Plato; or of Theism and Pantheism, as seen in the system of Leibniz and

Spinoza. In a few periods students would get an insight into the difference between the epistemological categories of Empiricism and Rationalism, as presented in the systems of Hume and Kant; or into the difference between the ethical categoris of Hedonism and Energism, as taught by Epicurus and the Stoics.

One does not need be a philosopher by vocation to teach this, though he must be acquainted with the subject. The half of the great thinkers in the past were not teachers of philosophy, but physicians, men of literary affairs, statesmen, theologians, historians, and scientists.

The Object of Teaching Philosophy

The main object of teaching philosophy is not to give the student a definite system, but to show him how to philosophize, to draw out the thinker in him. Whether he becomes an artist or an engineer, a teacher or an attorney, he would receive benefit by acquiring an understanding of the workings of the human mind, of the laws of thought, and of the principles of conduct. And why should he not derive benefit by pursuing the branches that deal with things in which the human race has been interested from its early civilization; psychology, logic, ethics, and, not to forget, history of philosophy, which gives a knowledge of the development of man's interpretation of reality? Surely, this should insure him against accepting a one-sided, narrow world view.

The Value of Psychology for Education

Important as all of these subdivisions are, I cannot omit dwelling somewhat on psychology. Psychology has been defined as the science of the soul; again, as the science of the mind; further, as the science of consciousness; and lastly, as the science of behavior. Professor Robert S. Woodworth states in a footnote in his Psychology that "a series of waggish critics has evolved the following: 'First psychology lost its soul, then it lost its mind, then it lost consciousness; it still has behavior, of a kind.'"

Psychology deals with processes of consciousness. It is not psychology, nor is it natural science, though much of the talk we hear about "brains" and "gray matter" and "head" would permit of the inference that psychology is a branch of physiology. The very common statement that we "think with our brains"—the statement was first made some generations after the discovery of America—shows how materialistic thought has colored our language. Professor Paulson, who advocates psycho-paralellism as an explanation of the apparent interaction of body and soul, denies outright that thinking is the function of the brain. He says thinking is the function of the entire man. Thought cannot be localized, in

the brain or in any other part of the human system. The brain is no more a special repository of thoughts than is a book. We say of a book, too, that it contains thoughts. In reality it contains only printer's ink. Those who claim thought as work of the brain make psychology a part of physiology, though no physician has ever been able to find a thought in the brain. They are ignorant of the setback this manner of viewing things has received at the hands of epistemology. We must not lose sight of the fact that psychology still is occupying itself with tasks that border on the physical and psychical. In natural sciences we deal with atoms and molecules, electrons but in psychology we deal with feelings, sensations, and endeavor, or shape and structure. Psychology can as little explain the essence of soul, as mechanics the essence of energy. We grant that all soul processes are tied up with the existence of the brain and the nervous system, but we hold, nevertheless, that all soul processes are peculiar according to their essence, incomparable with bodily processes. The processes of the brain do not shed any light on higher soul life—on an act of self-conquest, of logical deduction, of artistic contemplation, or of religious faith. The peculiarity of psychic occurrence is, to use the language of Wundt, the principle of the creative resultant, or creative synthesis. In psychic life, every result is more than the sum of the factors that determine the result. There is not only constancy, but growth in psychic life; a plus, not derivable from the physical factors by themselves.

The value of psychology for education even in its narrow sense is unquestioned, though it was questioned for a time even by men like James and Münsterberg, less than a generation ago. But these men were converted to other views, both writing, later, psychologies for teachers.

Essence of Man Is Will, Not Intellect

However, not a little of the psychology lying at the foundation of our current pedagogical ideas is of the Herbartian order, which exalts the intellect as the main and original activity of man. We regret this. For, modern psychology teaches that feeling and volition are the original forms of the activity of consciousness, and that intellectual activity is a later differentiation of mental life. One need only read William Jerusalem's splendid exposition of this in his "Problems of the Secondary Teacher" (Badger, Boston, 1918), or scan the pages of the philosophical works of a Wundt, a Friedrich Paulson, or a William James to find that the essence of man is not thinking, but volition; not the Intellect, but the Will. Any doubt as to the displacement of the Intellect as the sole umpire of man's actions will disappear if one reads what France's

greatest philosopher of this century, Bergson, has to say, when he pays his tribute to Intuition as the great thing in man, and regards the "fall of man" as consisting in the dethroning of Intuition and the enthroning of Intellect. No one who accepts this theory can endorse the statement of Socrates that knowledge is virtue, i. e., that the mere knowing of what is right will lead to the doing of right. History also proves that there have been centuries where men's actions have been far ahead of their thinking. An intuitive action has often saved a cause, when reflection would have killed it. The advice, Think before you act, is sometimes illdirected.

Education Separated from Philosophy Means Inward Annihilation of Education

Education, in its restricted or "professional" (to borrow normal school currency) sense was in former times generally taught by professors of philosophy, except in our country where numerous chairs in Education have been established in recent years. But leaders in education like James and Dewey, Judd and Spaulding were thoroughly trained in philosophy.

Europe is not as rich in college and university chairs of education as is our own country. However, this does not mean that European schools cherish inferior ideals as to education. England has certainly as high ideals relative to the study of English as has America. Yet, it is said with some sarcasm that America's field of English fairly teems with professors; that Harvard has twice as many professors of English as Oxford and Cambridge combined; and that the University of Chicago has almost as many as the whole of England!

In discussing the establishment of special professorships in education in European universities, Professor Friedrich Paulsen, well known for his standing both as educator and philosopher, writes that this plan would have its good sides, if education would keep in contact with philosophy. He says: "The separation of education from philosophy would be impossible. Without psychology and ethics education would be without any roots, since ethics and psychology cannot be separated from metaphysics and epistemology. If the demand for special chairs in education means a separation from philosophy, the result would be the inward annihilation of education." Paulsen finds the best solution in adding a new chair or department of philosophy to the two older recognized ones. There is already one chair, in most of the foreign universities, for the theoretical philosophical disciplines of psychology and logic. There is another for the history of philosophy. A third and new, chair should be established for giving instruction in practical philo-

sophy. It should concern itself with education and the history of education, and extend its work to ethics and psychology, which are the presuppositions of a theory of education.

In truth, much of the faddism we are suffering under in education today is due to the educational ventures that have no roots in philosophy. Well says W. Jerusalem, philosopher and educator, "The theory of education or pedagogy is closely related to the problems of philosophy particularly with psychology on the one hand and with ethics and sociology on the other. This explains why the fundamental theories of this discipline are generally due to thinkers who have devoted much time and attention to philosophic problems . . . A far more adequate philosophic preparation should be provided for teachers than is the case at present." This is said with reference to conditions in Austria, where the study of philosophy is obligatory in every gymnasium or college. Much more does the desideratum apply to the curricula in many of our schools, where philosophy is pretty much an invisible quantity.

Education in Its Restricted Sense Faces the Same Problems as Philosophy

John Dewey, one of America's greatest philosophers, says: "Since upon Education falls the burden of securing the practical realizing and balancing of the various interests of life, the *educator faces, if only in half-conscious, unsystematic form precisely the same questions that philosophers discuss in the abstract.*"

Dewey continues: In the attitude taken to matters of hygiene, physical training, manual training, corporal punishment, etc., there will be expressed, for example, some idea of the connection, or lack of connection, of mind and body—an idea that, made explicit and fitted in with other beliefs, corresponds to some typical philosophical theory of the relation of bodily and mental action. Some practices imply that man is an external compound of body and soul, in themselves two independent forces. Others proceed on the assumption that the body is a temporary shell in which the mind is housed, or that the body is a clog upon the development of spirit. Other projects imply that only through the adequate functioning of the bodily organs can there be realized a symmetrical and sound mental life. The various theories held by philosophers as to the relation of knowledge to practice are paralleled in educational procedure. Some assume that contemplative knowledge is an end in itself; others that knowledge is a mere external prerequisite for successful action. . . . The old philosophic question as to the relation of the individual to the established objective order appears in instruction as the individual initiative and choice over against the accu-

mulated body of organized knowledge which forms the ready-made subject matter of teaching. The philosophical controversy as to the method of knowledge, with its division of camps into sensationalists and rationalists, has a counterpart in the different methods of learning that are encouraged in schools. The philosophic split between mind and physical nature corresponds to the educational antagonism of humanistic and scientific studies, which also has a genuine, even if indirect, bearing upon the philosophic issue of idealism versus realism." . . . *Philosophy may be defined as the general theory of education:* the theory of which education is the corresponding art of practice. Philosophy . . . is the idea of which a *consciously guided education* is the practical counterpart." Thus far Dewey.

Dewey seems to emphasize that philosophy originated in Athens from the direct pressure of educational questions, like the following: What is the nature of state and law? What is the true end of life? How shall man know this end? Can virtue or excellence be taught? How? Is it a matter of practice and habit, or something intellectual? What is knowledge, its standard? If virtue can be learned, how is learning related to knowledge, etc? "The fact that the stream of European philosophic thought arose out of the discussion of educational ends and means, remains an eloquent witness to the ulterior motive and purpose of philosophic reflection."

Philosophy a Requirement of Education Abroad

In Germany philosophy is necessary for anyone who wants to teach in the gymnasium, corresponding to our high school and college. Many in Germany regard some university work in philosophy as essential to a liberal education. People who study law, medicine, theology, technology regularly attend lectures in philosophy. In fact the largest class in a university like Leipzig is the one in philosophy. 300 students would enroll for a course in philosophy, where only 60 or a hundred would enroll for other, general subjects.

The Ecole Normale in France, corresponding to the very best of our teachers colleges, requires two years of philosophy from all who intend to qualify as teachers of history and literature. Additional instruction in this branch is given for those who want to teach philosophy in the secondary schools.

In Austria philosophy has been a required college subject for more than seventy-three years. Two periods a week the last two years in the college are required for logic, history of philosophy, and psychology.

In the Scandinavian countries the requirement is about the same as in Austria. Philosophy is obligatory for all who enter the university.

In Italy philosophy is required to the extent of eight semester hours, though there is clamour for more. In all of these countries philosophy is considered as a part of liberal culture.

The Need of Idealism Over Against More Recent Systems of Philsophy

A great deal of thinking today is materialistic. The object of leading philosophic systems of materialism, naturalism and positivism is merely to fix and generalize what natural sciences have achieved. Materialism understands by reality the sensuous, that which is apprehended by the senses. It holds that everything which is an object of knowledge must be conceived and interpreted as it is apprehended by the natural sciences themselves. Theoretical materialism has been refuted, but materialism is still the belief of a majority, and has a great following among teachers. Haeckel is its leading prophet, his book "The Riddle of the Universe" being the most often published, read, and translated book on philosophy in this century. Professor Friedrich Paulson said, he felt ashamed, that such a book could be written, published, sold, and read in the land of a Goethe and Schiller. The book shows an ignorance of philosophy parallel only to the ignorance it displays about church and religion. We reject the world view of materialism.

Another system to be rejected is that of naturalism, holding that man himself remains just a part of nature, and is the object of sensuous knowledge. Even the highest and most ideal thoughts and aspirations of which man is capable are regarded by naturalism only as signs of his natural constitution, only as forms of his mortal earthly destiny. Nietzsche is the prophet of naturalism, a poet rather than a philosopher, insane when he wrote his richest work, dreaming about the superman, who in the course of development should surpass the present man physically, morally and mentally, as the present man surpasses the ape or the apelike being from whom, he, according to Nietzsche, sprang!

Positivism refrains from this onesided recognition and superlative regard for natural science and for the outward sensations of reality. But it objects to speculation. It has no use for metaphysics or a world view. It cultivates philosophy only from the standpoint of logic and epistemology. Like materialism and naturalism, it wants no interpretations connected with any religious needs. It regards these interpretations as neither possible nor necessary. Positivism is a widespread philosophy, in France, Italy, Germany, England, South America, and even our own country. In Norway, Ibsen was a positivist. It proclaims the glory of our achievement when we give all honor to natural reality and do not

bother ourselves with metaphysical speculations. We reject positivism, as we do naturalism and materialism.

We need Idealism as a philosophic system. Our former American leaders in thought were idealists, as our literature was idealistic. Our days were happier when Idealism reigned than now. For now, the philosophy of Bentham and Mill has laid hold of our country, as of all other countries. It is so intelligible and appears so practical that it brushes aside its but little superior system of Positivism. It links hands with materialism.

Bentham taught the maximum of pleasure regardless of cultural status. Individual happiness was to be the goal and to be attained by material values. Bentham's system, reinforced by the teachings of John Stuart Mill, means a harsh unlimited individualism, a cold egoistic ultilitarianism.

Spencer is the most consistent prophet of this kind of utilitarianism. He made the aim of education as "complete living." By this he means life here on earth alone. That education has anything to do with religion, or that it is of any, even remote importance for any life hereafter, does not worry this utilitarian. Spencer is the father of evolutionistic psychology. In fact he applied evolution to all of the sciences, his teaching being the most influential exponent of that theory today. According to his view, good is that which promotes the self-preservation of the individual and of the groups; bad is what retards it. This is utilitarianism of the clearest water. Morality he bases on inherited experience; and conscience he regards merely as organized experience.

What this shallow teaching means to education and culture is easily seen. And yet it controls the most favored educational policies of our country. Spencer's system has been ably combatted by English philosophers like Th. Green, Bradley and Martineau, who finds the solution of the riddle of the universe in Theism. But their voices are not heard, not even in our own country. We offer too much incense at the altars of Pragmatism, that school of philosophy, sponsored by James and Dewey, which judges truth according to its consequences, according to its value for knowledge and life—which really is nothing but another way of applying the criterion, "Does it pay?" Interesting as James is, he never got beyond agnosticism. And inspiring as Dewey is, he never felt the need of metaphysics.

One of the telling comments of late times on our philosophical and educational status is the popularity of Well's "History of the World," which is for history what Haeckel's "Riddle of the Universe" is for philosophy. Well's mind, so productive of fiction in the past, has not lost any of its fiction-portraying power in this

book, which is a compilation of facts arrayed and interpreted by the philosophy of positivism and utilitarianism, entertaining as a Punch and Judy show, but as different from real history as such a show is from a classic presentation of a Shakespearean play or an Ibsenian drama.

We need more ethical idealism in our philosophy and more idealism among the philosophers who are in a position to wield an influence on education. Idealism does not measure up to religion, but it helps to pave the way for religion, without which man is only half a man, only partially prepared for complete living.

And Idealism is coming. It is returning to Europe. President Burton's plea for religion as a part of education, at the National Educational Association meeting at Atlantic City a few years ago; and Frank Spaulding's criticism of the "Does-it-pay" motive, at the Chicago meeting of the same Association, are indications of an approaching Idealism. Idealism is returning to philosophy. That guarantees also its return to Education, in the wider as well as the narrower sense.

Die Geschichte der deutschen Theologie seit Schleiermacher.

Von Prof. Dr. R. H. Grützmacher.

I.

Schleiermacher.

Wie in der Geschichte überhaupt, so hinterläßt auch in der Geschichte der Theologie jede wirklich lebendige Macht ihre Spuren bis zur Gegenwart. Die christliche Theologie hat manche Beeinflussungen in der Formulierung ihrer Wahrheiten durch vor- und außerchristliche Philosophie empfangen. Die Kirchenväter standen besonders unter dem Einfluß des Platonismus und des Neuplatonismus, die mittelalterlichen und zum Teil auch die altprotestantischen Theologen unter denen des Aristoteles. Aber der eigentliche Gehalt der christlichen Theologie wurde doch stets durch die Bibel bestimmt, jedoch mit dem Unterschied, daß bald die alttestamentlichen Bestandteile, bald ein Paulus oder Johannes oder auch die drei ersten Evangelien am stärksten wirkten. In der protestantischen Theologie löste naturgemäß die Lebens- und Ideenwelt der Reformatoren die kräftigste Nachfolge aus, hier mehr Luthers geniale Intuitionen, dort mehr die geschlossene Systematik Kalvins. Selbst die Epigonen-Theologie des ausgehenden sechzehnten und des ganzen siebzehnten Jahrhunderts ist immer wieder repristiniert worden. Der Pietismus brachte eine religiöse Vertiefung, die in der Theologie ihr Echo in der Betonung der lebendigen Erfahrung dauernd fand. Der Rationalismus nötigte die moralischen Konsequenzen der christlichen Weltanschauung schärfer herauszuarbeiten.

Alle diese theologischen Richtungen haben ihre Spuren bei dem Begründer der neueren protestantischen Theologie **Schleiermacher** hinterlassen. In ihm lebt ein Stück Platonismus wieder auf. Die Heilige Schrift, sonderlich in ihren Johanneischen Bestandteilen ist ihm Urquell. Die reformierte Dogmatik wird in einer Reihe seiner Lehren lebendig. Aus dem Pietismus stammt seine Gefühlsreligion. Der Rationalismus nötigte ihn das sittliche Ziel des Christentums besonders zu betonen. Aus allen diesen verschiedenen Zuflüssen gelang es aber Schleiermacher einen neuen Strom zu schaffen, sodaß er mit Recht am Anfang derjenigen theologischen Bewegungen steht, welche das neunzehnte Jahrhundert ausfüllten und auch in der Gegenwart noch fortwirkten. Infolgedessen hat ein Ueberblick über die Haupttypen der protestantischen Thelogie des neunzehnten und zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts in Deutschland, der in dieser Zeitschrift dargeboten werden soll, mit ihm zu beginnen. Während I. **Schleiermacher** für sich steht und keine Schule im engeren Sinne des Wortes gebildet hat, entstehen nach ihm in sich geschlossene Gruppen: II. **Die altliberale Theologie,** III. **Die konfessionelle und positive**

Vermittlungstheologie, IV. **Die Ritschlsche Theologie,** V. **Die religionsgeschichtliche Theologie** und VI. **Die Theologie der Gegenwart,** die sich mehr in einzelne Erscheinungen auflöst.

1.

Schleiermachers Persönlichkeit.

D. F. Schleiermacher wurde am 21. November 1768 als der Sohn eines reformierten Feldpredigers geboren, und bekam dadurch von Hause aus eine Neigung für die reformierte Konfession. Mit 15 Jahren kam er in die Erziehungsanstalten der Herrenhuter. Die dort vertretene warme gefühlsmäßige Frömmigkeit wie die christozentrische Blut- und Wundentheologie machte auf ihn einen starken Eindruck, sodaß er sich auch später noch als einen „Herrenhuter höherer Ordnung" bezeichnete. Sodann aber regte sich bei ihm ein scharfer kritischer Sinn, der ihn zu tiefgehenden Zweifeln an dem überlieferten Christentum führte. Auf der Universität Halle vertiefte er sich in alle geistigen Strömungen seiner Zeit, besonders auch in Kant, mit dem er sich aber doch dauernd innerlich nicht befreunden konnte. Stärker dagegen beeinflußte ihn Plato, dessen Uebersetzer er später wurde, und von neueren Philosophen besonders Spinoza, dem er eine Locke zu opfern forderte. Aber stärker noch als die strenge Philosophie beeinflußte ihn die neu aufkommende künstlerische Romantik. Mit einem ihrer Hauptvertreter Schlegel lebte er eine zeitlang nicht nur äußerlich, sondern auch innerlich eng zusammen. Seine ganze Weltanschauung und Lebenshaltung gewann einen starken Anflug des romantischen Aesthetizismus, sodaß er Religion und Kunst nach Form und Inhalt einander möglichst zu nähern suchte.

Nach Absolvierung seiner theologischen Examina und einer Hauslehrerstelle in einer vornehmen Familie, wurde er von 1796 bis 1802 Prediger an dem großen Krankenhaus der Charite in Berlin, geriet aber hier so stark in die Berliner Strömungen hinein, daß er selbst in das „Exil" eines kleinen pommerschen Städtchen für einige Jahre ging. 1804 wurde er als Professor nach Halle berufen, las dort über fast alle theologischen Fächer. Da er sich an der Vorbereitung der nationalen Erhebung durch seine Predigten beteiligt hatte, mußte er Halle verlassen, als dieses unter französische Herrschaft kam. Er wurde in Berlin Prediger an der Dreifaltigkeitskirche und 1810 auch Professor an der neugegründeten Universität. In diesem sehr arbeitsreichen Doppelamt des Praktikers und Theoretikers, das aber seinem innersten Wesen entsprach, blieb er sein ganzes Leben. Er übte eine außerordentlich erfolgreiche Tätigkeit als Professor wie als Prediger, griff in alle kirchlichen Fragen ein, wie die von ihm warm begrüßte Union und die Neugestaltung der von ihm kritisch beurteilten königlichen Agende. Ende Januar 1834

erkrankte er und offenbarte in seiner letzten Stunde mit besondrer Deutlichkeit die charakteristischen Züge seines inneren Wesens. Er begehrte das Abendmahl zu feiern und sagte nach der Rezitation der Einsetzungsworte: „Auf diesen Worten der Schrift beharre ich, sie sind das Fundament meines Glaubens.“ Aber da ihm der Arzt den Wein verboten hatte, feierte er das Mahl mit Brot und Wasser — gläubig an das Wort von der Versöhnung, aber frei und kritisch gegenüber der äußeren Form seiner Darbietung. Dann sagte er noch: „Ich muß die tiefsten spekulativen Gedanken denken und sie sind mir völlig eins mit den innigsten religiösen Empfindungen.“ Dieser Verbindung von Frömmigkeit und Spekulation unter Wahrung ihrer beiderseitigen Eigenart hatte sein ganzes Schaffen gegolten.

2.

Die Reden über die Religion!

Im Jahre 1799 ließ Schleiermacher zunächst anonym eine Schrift erscheinen: „Ueber die Religion, Reden an die Gebildeten unter ihren Verächtern.“ Einleitend bezeichnet er es als seine Absicht zu den gebildeten Deutschen, die im Unterschied zu Engländern und Franzosen die Religion verachten, von den „heiligen Mysterien der Menschheit“ aus seiner persönlichen Erfahrung heraus zu reden. Die Religion nennt im seelischen Leben eine besondre Provinz ihr eigen, die getrennt liegt von dem reflektiven Denken und dem moralischen Handeln: „Ihr **Wesen** ist weder Denken noch Handeln, sondern Anschauung und Gefühl.“ Diese Anschauung ist ein unmittelbares Schauen, das vom Blick auf die Natur und die Menschheit aus geht, dann aber das ganze „Universum“ mit der Phantasie erfaßt. „Anschauung des Universums ist die allgemeine und höchste Formel der Religion.“ Den Begriff des Universums ersetzt Schleiermacher durch eine ganze Reihe andrer Ausdrücke wie „das Eine und Ganze, das Unendliche im Endlichen sich darstellend, das Himmlische, das ewige und heilige Schicksal, die ewige Vorsehung, die lebendige Gottheit.“ Dagegen lehnt Schleiermacher die Erhebung des Universums zu einem persönlichen Gott als eigentlichem Gegenstand der Religion ab; ja er kennt sogar Religion ohne Gott. „Wenn ihr nun nicht leugnen könnt, daß sich die Idee von Gott zu jeder Anschauung des Universums bequemt, so müßt ihr auch zugeben, daß eine Religion ohne Gott besser sein kann, als eine andre mit Gott.“ Schleiermacher vertritt in der ersten Auflage seiner Reden eine durchaus immanent pantheistische Religiosität. Denn auch der Glaube an sein persönliches individuelles Fortleben im Jenseits gehört nicht zum Wesen echter Religion. Vielmehr gilt: „Mitten in der Endlichkeit eins werden mit dem Unendlichen und ewig sein in jedem Augenblick, das ist die Unsterblichkeit der Religion.“

Die fromme Anschauung des Universums ist von einem Gefühl begleitet und zwar von einem solchen der Abhängigkeit und Bedingtheit des Individiums durch das Universum. Das Universum ist der aktive Faktor, der im religiösen Menschen eine „kindliche Passivität erzeugt: „Religiöse Gefühle sind Erfurcht vor dem Ewigen und Unsichtbaren, Demut und Dankbarkeit, Freude, Zuversicht und Vertrauen. Im Grund bestimmt Schleiermacher ähnlich wie die Bibel und die Reformation das subjektive Wesen der Religion als Fürchten und Lieben. In ihnen aber sieht er die Hauptsache in der Religion, so daß diese einen subjektivistischen Charakter gewinnt und eigentlich nur noch Psychologie ist. Sodann erhält die Religiosität bei Schleiermacher — im Anschluß an Griechentum und Romantik — einen stark ästhetischen, plastisch-musikalischen Charakter. Sie wird zum mystischen Genuß, der auf klare Erkenntnis und sittliches Handeln verzichtet. Schleiermacher bereitet jene Religiosität vor, wie sie sich im neunzehnten und zwanzigsten Jahrhundert nicht selten findet und bei der das Theater — etwa durch das Bühnenweihfestspiel R. Wagners — die religiösen Stimmungen und den kirchlichen Kultus ersetzt.

In der dritten Rede spricht Schleiermacher über die **„Anlage zur Religion,"** die jeder Mensch besitzt, die sich aber in den religiösen Helden, Virtuosen, Mitteln besonders kräftig verwirklicht. In der vierten Rede handelt Schleiermacher über **„das Gesellige in der Religion** oder über Kirche und Priestertum." Die Religion schafft das vollendetste Resultat der menschlichen Geselligkeit, „eine Akademie von Priestern, einen Chor von Freunden, einen Bund von Brüdern." Diese ist freilich vollkommen verschieden von der empirischen Kirche, deren tiefgehende religiöse Mängel vor allen Dingen auf ihre Verbindung mit dem Staat zurückgehen. „Hinweg also mit jeder solcher Verbindung zwischen Kirche und Staat."

Die fünfte Rede, die von besonderer Bedeutung ist, erörtert unter dem Titel **„Ueber die Religionen"** das religionsgeschichtliche Problem und die Stellung des Christentums innerhalb der Religionsgeschichte. Obwohl Schleiermacher die Religion zu der natürlichen Anlage eines jeden Menschen rechnet, lehnt er doch die Existenz einer allgemeinen natürlichen, überall identischen Religion im Sinn des Rationalismus und von Lessings Nathan ab. Die Religion hat sich vielmehr geschichtlich von jeher in bestimmten positiven Einzelreligionen individualisiert, deren Eigenart es zu bestimmen gilt. Schleiermacher beschränkt sich auf das Judentum und das Christentum. Im Judentum tritt wesentlich der Gegensatz und die Reaktion des Unendlichen gegen das Endliche hervor. Auch im **Christentum** wird zunächst die Disharmonie wehmütig empfunden, dann aber ihre erlösende Vermittlung behauptet. „Das Verderben und die Erlösung, die Feindschaft und die Vermittlung, das sind die

beiden unzertrennlich miteinander verbundenen Seiten dieser Anschauung." Diese Vermittlung vollzieht sich in **Jesus** in dessen Seele sich die Idee ausbildete, „daß alles Endliche höherer Vermittlungen bedarf um mit der Gottheit zusammen zu kommen." Jesus selbst besitzt diese echte Religiosität und hat die Fähigkeit, sie andern mitzuteilen; er besitzt darum das Bewußtsein, ein Mittler zwischen Gott und den Menschen zu sein. Aber Christus hat nie behauptet der einzige Mittler zu sein, sodaß auch das Christentum nicht als „die einzige Gestalt der Religion in der Menschheit allein herrschen kann." — Mit der Behauptung, daß alle Religion nicht als natürliche, sondern nur in geschichtlich positiver Form besteht, wie in der Verbindung des Wesens des Christentums mit dem Mittleramt Jesu, bewegt sich Schleiermacher in der Linie des Altprotestantismus. Dagegen bahnt seine mehr philosophische als religiös-ethische Wesensbestimmung und vor allem die Aufgabe der religionsgeschichtlichen Absolutheit des Christentums und Christi neuprotestantische und moderne Ideen an.

3.

Schleiermachers Auffassung der Theologie.

Sein wissenschaftlich theologisches Programm entfaltet Schleiermacher in seinem wesentlich aus Thesen bestehenden Büchlein „Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums," 1811. **Er bestimmt hier sowohl das Wesen der Theologie als Wissenschaft, wie den Zusammenhang und die Aufgabe der einzelnen theologischen Disziplinen.** Die Theologie soll nicht eine besondre Wissenschaft sein aus theoretischen Gründen, sondern nur durch ihre praktische Abzweckung auf die Leitung der Kirche. „Die christliche Theologie ist der Inbegriff derjenigen wissenschaftlichen Kenntnisse und Kunstregeln, ohne deren Besitz und Gebrauch eine zusammenstimmende Leitung der christlichen Kirche, das heißt ein christliches Kirchenregiment, nicht möglich ist." Die Theologie ist im Grunde danach nur eine kirchliche Technik und infolgedessen die „praktische Theologie die Krone des theologischen Studiums." Auf der andern Seite allerdings fordert Schleiermacher eine **philosophische Theologie,** die ihren Ausgangspunkt über und vor dem Christentum nimmt. Wir würden heute von Religionsphilosophie reden. Diese bestimmt von sich aus, unabhängig vom christlichen Glauben, alle entscheidenden Begriffe des Christentums und der Kirche nach ihrem Wesens und Wahrheitsgehalt. Die innertheologischen Disziplinen der Dogmatik und Ethik haben mit den entscheidenden Wahrheitsfragen nichts zu tun, sondern nur den tatsächlich bestehenden Glaubens- und Sittlichkeitsbestand zu schildern. „Die zusammenhängende Darstellung der Lehre, wie sie zu einer gegebenen Zeit geltend ist, bezeichnen wir durch den Ausdruck Dogmatik." — Durch die Aufgabe der wissenschaftlichen Selbständigkeit der Theologie und ihre Abhängigkeit von einer

philosophischen Theologie hat Schleiermacher die neuprotestantische Umwandlung der Theologie in Religionsphilosophie angebahnt und das Christentum in seinem Wahrheitsgehalt von allgemeinen Spekulationen abhängig gemacht. In der Betonung der praktischen Abzweckung hat zwar Schleiermacher an die kirchliche Zielsetzung der Altprotestantischen Theologie angeknüpft und auch einen im anglo-amerikanischen Kulturkreis weit verbreiteten theologischen Typus vorbereitet; aber er hat doch auch dadurch den Ernst und die Selbständigkeit der Wahrheitsfrage gefährdet.

Die religiöse und wissenschaftliche Auffassung vom Christentum, wie sie bisher geschildert wurde, hat Schleiermacher vereinigt und ausgeführt in: **„Der christliche Glaube** nach den Grundsätzen der evangelischen Kirche im Zusammenhang dargestellt." (1821—22.) **Dieses Buch ist die berühmteste und einflußreichste Dogmatik der gesamten neueren Theologie geworden.** Die Sprache ist nicht mehr romantisch wie in den „Reden," aber auch nicht mehr so knapp wie in der „Kurzen Darstellung," sondern dialektisch durchgeführt, jedes einzelne Wort durch seinen Zusammenhang in einem besonderen Sinn bestimmt. — Die entscheidenden Prinzipien für die christliche Glaubenslehre werden auch hier andern, außer- und übertheologischen Wissenschaften entnommen, so der „Ethik," einer Art soziologischer Geschichtsphilosophie, und der Religionsphilosophie. Aehnlich wie in den Reden wird zunächst die **Frömmigkeit** bestimmt als eine Bestimmtheit des Gefühles und zwar eines Gefühles, „daß wir uns unserer selbst als **schlechthin abhängig** oder was dasselbe sagen will als in Beziehung mit Gott bewußt sind." Dieses Gefühl steht im Gegensatz zu jedem Freiheitsgefühl, das wir gegenüber der Welt haben. Das „Woher" dieser Abhängigkeit nennen wir Gott, den wir zunächst nur in diesem Gefühl selbst und nicht als eine außerhalb seiner bestehende und es hervorrufende Größe haben. Streng genommen hat die Dogmatik allein diese fromme Gemütszustände darzustellen. „Christliche Glaubenssätze sind Auffassungen frommer Gemütszustände." Nur als ein Zugeständnis an die traditionelle Auffassung bezeichnet es Schleiermacher, wenn er auch in seiner Dogmatik diesen subjektiv psychologischen Aussagen noch objektiv geschichtliche oder metaphysische Sätze über Eigenschaften Gottes wie über Beschaffenheiten der Welt folgen läßt. **Schleiermacher hält mithin auch in der Glaubenslehre an seiner wesentlich subjektiv religionspsychologischen Behandlung des Christentums fest.** Für ihn steht der Mensch mit seinen frommen Gefühlen im Mittelpunkt und nicht Gott mit seinem Handeln. Gott ist noch immer stark pantheistisch gedacht. Schleiermacher ist und bleibt der Anfänger einer religionspsychologischen, anthropozentrischen, pantheisierenden Richtung in der neueren Dogmatik.

Im Unterschied zu diesen Gedankengängen vollzieht Schleier-

macher eine gewisse Wendung zur Geschichte und Methaphysik in der **Definition des Christentums.** Auch in der Glaubenslehre wird jene durch den Vergleich mit der Definition andrer frommer Gemeinschaften gewonnen. Unterscheidungs- und zugleich Wertmaßstab für die verschiedenen Religionen ist das Verhältnis zwischen Natürlichem und Sittlichem. Eine Religion, die auf Sittlichkeit als ihr Telos hinzielt, gehört der „teleologischen Richtung der Frömmigkeit" an. Die spezifische Eigenart des Christentums besteht jedoch erst in der religiösen Beziehung auf Christus und die von ihm ausgehende Erlösung. So kommt denn die berühmte Definition des Christentums in §11 der Glaubenslehre zustande: „Das Christentum ist eine der teleologischen Richtung der Frömmigkeit angehörige monotheistische Glaubensweise und unterscheidet sich von andern wesentlich dadurch, daß alles in derselben bezogen wird auf die von Jesus von Nazareth vollbrachte Erlösung." Im Unterschied zum Rationalismus einschließlich der Gedankenwelt eines Kant, für den Jesus nur Lehrer und Vorbild oder gar nur geschichtsloses Idealbild sittlichen Lebens war, bekennt sich Schleiermacher hier im Sinn der Bibel und der Reformation zu dem geschichtlichen Jesus als Erlöser. **Er bahnt damit die christozentrische Richtung in der positiven Theologie des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts an.**

In der speziellen Ausführung der Dogmatik wie in der Sündenlehre, der Christologie und Soteriologie vollzieht allerdings Schleiermacher noch sehr starke Umdeutungen und Verflüchtigungen, die zum guten Teil durch griechische, platonische Vorstellungen beeinflußt sind. Die **Sünde** ist nur der positive Widerstreit der Sinnlichkeit wider den Geist, wodurch dieser an der Verwirklichung seines Gottesbewußtseins gehindert wird. „Sünde ist eine durch die Selbständigkeit der sinnlichen Funktionen verursachte Hemmung der bestimmenden Macht des Geistes. Wir sind uns der Sünde bewußt als der Kraft und des Werkes einer Zeit, in welcher die Richtung auf das Gottesbewußtsein noch nicht hervorgetreten war." Die Sünde ist mithin nicht — reformatorisch — in erster Linie der willenmäßige Gegensatz zu Gott, sondern eine Disharmonie zwischen den verschiedenen Kräften des Menschen, die ein Hervortreten des Gottesbewußtseins hemmen. Infolgedessen handelt es sich auch bei der **Erlösung** nur um eine subjektive Beeinflussung des Menschen. Seine seelischen Hemmungen werden beseitigt, dadurch sein Gottesbewußtsein gestärkt und seine Seligkeitsempfindung gekräftigt: „Der Erlöser nimmt die Gläubigen in die Kräftigkeit seines Gottesbewußtseins auf und das ist seine erlösende Tätigkeit. Der Erlöser nimmt die Gläubigen auf in die Gemeinschaft seiner ungetrübten Seligkeit und dies ist seine versöhnende Tätigkeit." Die Vergebung der Schuld dagegen und erst recht die objektive Versöhnung mit Gott treten fast ganz zurück. Nicht Gott ändert sein

Verhalten, sondern nur das menschliche Verhältnis zu Gott wird geändert und zwar so, daß erst aus der sittlichen Umgestaltung eine neue religiöse Beziehung erwächst: „Das Aufgenommenwerden in die Lebensgemeinschaft mit Christo ist als verändertes Verhältnis des Menschen zu Gott betrachtet, seine **Rechtfertigung** als veränderte Lebensform betrachtet seine **Bekehrung.** Infolgedessen werden auch die historischen und metaphysischen Lebenszüge im Bild Christi fast ganz gestrichen. Die sogenannten **Heilstatsachen** fallen als dogmatisch gleichgültig dahin: „Die Tatsachen der Auferstehung und der Himmelfahrt Christi sowie die Vorhersagung seiner Wiederkunft zum Gericht, können nicht als eigentliche Bestandteile der Lehre von seiner Person aufgestellt werden."

Der **Person Christi** jedoch bemüht sich Schleiermacher eine besondre Stellung anzuweisen. Seine Menschheit unterscheidet sich dadurch, daß er nicht nur zufällig, sondern wesentlich unsündlich ist und „auf keine Weise irgendwann erlösungsbedürftig gedacht, daher auch, wie die allgemeine Stimme aussagt, ursprünglich von allen andern Menschen unterschieden und mit erlösender Kraft von seiner Geburt aus ausgestattet ist. Infolgedessen wird auch seine ganze Persönlichkeit nicht aus seiner Umwelt erklärt, sondern er als eine Neuschöpfung des Menschen, als ein zweiter Adam verstanden. „Sein eigentümlicher geistiger Gehalt kann nicht aus dem Gehalt des menschlichen Lebenskreises, dem er angehörte, erklärt werden, sondern nur aus der allgemeinen Quelle des geistigen Lebens durch einen schöpferischen göttlichen Akt, in welchem sich als einem absolut größtem der Begriff des Menschen als Subjekt des Gottesbewußtseins vollendet." Schleiermacher möchte auch als Ersatz der Lehre von der Gottheit Christi ihn in eine möglichst enge Verbindung mit Gott bringen, gelangt doch aber nicht weiter als bis zu der Behauptung, „daß die stetige Kräftigkeit seines Gottesbewußtseins" mit einem eigentlichen Sein Gottes in ihm identifiziert wird. Eine wirkliche Menschwerdung Gottes in Christus konnte Schleiermacher nicht behaupten, da er ihre Voraussetzung die **Dreieinigkeitslehre** in Gott völlig umgestaltet. Er behandelt sie erst am Schluß seiner Dogmatik und zwar andeutend in der Richtung, daß er die kirchliche Vorstellung durch die des Sabellius wiederersetzen möchte, nach welcher der eine Gott in der Geschichte nur verschiedene Offenbarungsformeln angenommen hat. Er erklärt: „Da wir diese Lehre um so weniger für abgeschlossen halten können als sie bei der Feststellung der evangelischen Kirche keine neue Bearbeitung erfahren hat, so muß ihr noch eine auf ihre ersten Anfänge zurückgehende Umgestaltung bevorstehen." Ebenso ablehnend wie gegen die in der Trinitätslehre zum Ausdruck kommenden Methaphysik verhält sich Schleiermacher auch gegen eine wirklich transzendente Ausgestaltung der **Eschatologie.** Er

behauptet darum, daß „den kirchlichen Lehren von den letzten Dingen nicht der gleiche Wert kann beigelegt werden."

So bemüht sich Schleiermacher in seiner Glaubenslehre stetig um einen Kompromiß zwischen den überlieferten methaphysischen und geschichtlichen Bestandteilen des Christentums und seiner subjektivistischen und psychologischen pantheisierenden und modernisierenden Weltanschauung. Schleiermachers Glaubenslehre ist fraglos durch seine **Philosophie** stark bestimmt, wenn er das auch selbst — allerdings nicht mit voller Ueberzeugung — zu bestreiten sucht. Sagt er doch einmal: „Meinem eigenen philosophischen Dilektantismus würde ich keinen Einfluß auf den Inhalt der Glaubenslehre gestattet haben. Wie es mir mit diesem Vorsatz gelungen ist, das freilich ist eine andre Frage." Schleiermachers wirkliches Ideal ist doch die Verbindung der Philosophie mit der Frömmigkeit, des Christentums mit der Wissenschaft. Seine größte Furcht für die Zukunft kommt darum in der Frage zum Ausdruck: „Soll der Knoten der Geschichte so ausgehen, das Christentum mit der Barbarei und die Wissenschaft mit dem Unglauben?"

4.

Schleiermachers Ethik.

Ist für Schleiermacher das Christentum ethische Erlösungsreligion so hat für ihn die Ethik eine besondre Bedeutung. Aber auch seine christliche Ethik ist sehr stark bedingt durch seine allgemein „humane." Ihre Prinzipien hat er ausgesprochen in den **„Monologen"** (1801) dem Seitenstück — auch in der romantischen Sprache — zu den „Reden." Ausgeführt hat er sie in den aus dem Nachlaß herausgegebenen **„Entwurf eines Systems der Sittenlehre"** (1835). Auch die christliche Ethik liegt nur in einem aus dem Nachlaß herausgegebenen Kollegheft **„Die christliche Sitte"** (1843) vor. Gegenstand der sittlichen Beobachtung ist der innere Mensch in seiner Freiheit. Ist für die Religion das Abhängigkeitsgefühl grundlegend, so in der Ethik das Bewußtsein der Freiheit. Im Innersten der eigenen Persönlichkeit erfaßt der einzelne Mensch zugleich die Menschheit. Darum ist ethische Aufgabe sowohl **Ausbildung der eigenen Individualität, wie die liebende Verbindung mit der Menschheit.** „Immermehr zu werden was ich bin, das ist mein einziger Wille; jede Handlung ist eine besondre Entwicklung dieses einen Willens. Keine Bildung ohne Liebe, und ohne eigene Bildung keine Vollendung in der Liebe." Die Verwirklichung dieses Ideals schafft ewige Jugend noch im Alter, so daß Schleiermacher das griechische Ideal der Jugend mit dem alttestamentlichen im Greis verbindet. „Das habe ich ergriffen und lasse es nimmer und so seh ich lächelnd schwinden der Augen Licht, und keimen das weiße Haar zwischen den blonden Locken. Nichts was geschehen kann,

mag mir das Herz beklemmen, frisch bleibt der Puls des inneren Lebens bis in den Tod." Die Hauptform der sozialen Verbindung sind die Freundschaft und die Ehe.

Während er in der philosophischen Ethik die Einteilung in Güter, Pflichten, Tugenden zugrunde legt, läßt er in der christlichen Ethik, das von Gott empfangene neue Leben darstellen und wirksam verbreiten. „Sie wird die Darstellung der durch die Gemeinschaft mit Christo, dem Erlöser, bedingten Gemeinschaft mit Gott sein müssen, sofern dieselbe das Motiv aller Handlungen des Christen ist; sie wird nichts sein können, als eine Beschreibung derjenigen Handlungsweise, welche aus der Herrschaft des christlich bestimmten religiösen Selbstbewußtseins entsteht." Das darstellende Handeln trägt stark kultisch-ästetischen Charakter. Bei dem wirksamen Handeln folgt auf die Reinigung eine Verbreitung des christlichen Geistes in der Natur. Hier erst kommt die spezifische Eigentümlichkeit der Schleiermacherschen Sittenlehre zum klaren Durchbruch. Das Christentum hat die natürliche Entwicklung von allen Hemmungen zu befreien und sich mit ihr so zu vermählen, daß eine christliche Kultur entsteht. „Das was wir Geist nennen im allgemein menschlichen Sinne und was Pneuma im christlichen ist etwas wesentlich zusammengehöriges. Das Pneuma ist nur eine höhere Entwicklung von dem was wir Vernunft nennen. Es ist kein absoluter Gegensatz zwischen Natur und Gnade." Die asketischen weltgegensätzlichen Züge der christlichen Ethik treten fast vollständig zu gunsten der positiven innerweltlichen zurück. Schleiermachers ganze Neigung gehört der **christlichen Kultur, der christlichen Welt.** Er knüpft damit mehr als an das Urchristentum an die Tendenz des Katholizismus zu einer christlichen Einheitskultur an und bereitet den Gedanken einer neuprotestantischen Kulturethik vor, die dann unter seinen Anregungen zunächst R. Rothe ausgeführt hat.

5.

Schleiermachers Bedeutung.

Schleiermachers geschichtliche Bedeutung ist über allen Zweifel erhaben. Alle Richtungen des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts haben entweder positiv von ihm gelernt oder sich wenigstens negativ mit ihm auseinandergesetzt. **Die äußerste Rechte wie die äußerste Linke in Theologie und Philosophie haben ihn am schärfsten abgelehnt.** Ein Theologe wie Philippi bekämpft Schleiermacher ununterbrochen in seiner Glaubenslehre — insofern nicht mit Unrecht, als neuerdings ein ganz anders denkender Theologe, H. Stephan, feststellen mußte: Schleiermacher hat die Theologie an Luther vorbeigeführt. Auf der Linken hat D. F. Strauß in den Spuren Hegels, der sich auch persönlich mit Schleiermacher durchaus nicht stand, seine Glaubenslehre um ihres vermittelnden Charakters willen aufs schärfste

verspottet. Nietzsche geht noch einen Schritt weiter, wenn er von Schleiermachers „Zerblasenheit" redet und sagt: „Wer an der Hegelei und Schleiermacherei erkrankt ist, wird nie wieder ganz kuriert." Die andern Richtungen verbinden Anerkennung und Kritik. Die Erlanger Theologen, wie Hofmann und Frank erkennen bei Schleiermacher den psychologischen Ausgangspunkt an, tadeln aber, daß er nicht zur Geschichte und Metaphysik vorgedrungen ist, und Sünde, Erlösung, Rechtfertigung bei ihm ungedeutet sind. Ritschl wird von der starken Betonung des ethischen Elementes angezogen, findet aber zuviel Psychologie und Mystik bei Schleiermacher. Wesentlich positiver ist die Stellung der religionsgeschichtlichen Theologie und Troelsch meinte, daß man auf den Grundlagen Schleiermachers weiterbauen müsse, wenn auch kaum ein Stein des darauf von Schleiermacher errichteten Gebäudes noch stehen bleiben dürfte. Eine Reihe der neuesten Theologen wenden sich wieder scharf gegen Schleiermacher. Schäder macht ihm den Vorwurf, daß er das theozentrische Element aus der Religion entfernt habe, zugunsten des antropozentrischen. Ein Theologe aus dem Kreis Barths, Brunner, nennt ihn sogar den „theologischen Paganini" und fordert einen absoluten Bruch mit Schleiermachers Theologie.

All diesen verschiedenen Urteilen gegenüber wird man zu sagen haben, daß Schleiermacher der **Anfänger** der neueren Theologie bleibt, der ihr religiös wie wissenschaftlich in der neueren Geisteswelt erfolgreich Bahn gebrochen hat und ohne den sie überhaupt nicht existierte. Auf der andern Seite wird man ebenso bestimmt zu betonen haben, daß seine Theologie eben nur einen Anfang, eine Brücke, einen Uebergang darstellt, aber noch keinen Abschluß. Man darf darum bei Schleiermacher nicht verharren, geschweige denn zu ihm zurückkehren, sondern man muß an ihn anknüpfen, um über ihn fortzuschreiten.

Die „Religion Jesu."

Von Prof. Dr. W. Baur.

(Fortsetzung.)

5. Jesus und das Himmelreich.

Der Hintergrund. Die kurzen Sätze bei Markus und Matthäus, die wie die Ankündigung eines Programms klingen, legen es uns nahe, zunächst den Hintergrund zu malen, von dem sich Jesu Worte deutlich abheben.

„Die Zeit ist erfüllt." Wenn wir dieses von Markus überlieferte Worte verstehen wollen, müssen wir bei Lukas eine Anleihe machen. Dieser Evangelist zeigt uns anschaulich, wie und was Jesus predigte. Er las in der Synagoge zu Nazareth aus dem Propheten Jesaja: „Der Geist des Herrn ist auf mir, weil der Herr mich gesalbt hat, um die sich ihm Beugenden mit froher Botschaft zu erfreuen; er hat mich gesandt, die zu verbinden, die am Herzen verwundet sind; zu verkünden den Gefangenen Freiheit und den Gebundenen Entfesselung; zu verkünden das Gnadenjahr des Herrn und den Rachetag unsers Gottes; zu trösten alle Traurigen." Aus Jesajas 58, 6 fügt unser Text (der griechische) noch hinzu: „Und den Zerschlagenen, daß sie frei und ledig sein sollen," und mit Lev. 25, 10 hängt zusammen: „Und zu verkündigen das angenehme Jahr des Herrn."

Indem Jesus nach Verlesung des Abschnittes behauptet: „Heute ist diese Schrift erfüllt vor euren Ohren," weist er damit auf die (mit ihm angebrochene) neue Zeit hin, als die Erfüllung alter Prophetenworte. Es ist die Wende der Zeiten: Nun muß sich „alles, alles wenden." Ich, der Helfer, bin ja da: Das gehört zum Hintergrund. Der Nachweis, wie sich das mit Jesu „Religion" vereinigen läßt, bleibt denen überlassen, die der Meinung sind, Jesus selbst gehöre nicht in das von ihm gepredigte Evangelium hinein.

„Das Königreich Gottes ist herbeigekommen." Was bei Matthäus das Königreich des Himmels genannt wird, heißt bei Markus und Lukas das Königreich Gottes. Jesus wird das Reich bald mit dem einen, bald mit dem andern Ausdruck bezeichnet haben. In beiden Fällen ist seine Art als überirdische festgelegt. Es ist nicht menschlicher, überhaupt nicht irdischer Herkunft. Es ist aber jetzt da: Wie mag der Prediger das gemeint haben? Soll es heißen: Jetzt herrscht Gott auf Erden? Das müßte dann, wenn mit Jesus die Wende der Zeiten gekommen war, heißen: Darin besteht die neue Zeit, daß jetzt Gott auf Erden herrscht. Das ist doch abzuweisen; auch in dieser Form: Von jetzt an soll Gottes Willen die Menschen regieren. Vielmehr stoßen wir auch hier wieder auf den Hintergrund: Mit mir und in mir ist das Reich Gottes in die

irdische Erscheinung getreten. Darum gilt: Von jetzt an ist eine einzigartige Möglichkeit gegeben, Gottes Willen zu erkennen und zu verwirklichen.

„Aendert eure Gesinnung." Lukas, der jene programmartigen Sätze nicht hat, erzählt uns von der Predigt Jesu in Nazareth. Aus ihr geht hervor, daß Jesus von der neuen Zeit (Gnadenjahr) redete; es fehlt aber die Aufforderung zur Sinnesänderung, oder sie klingt nur schwach durch, indem von dem Rachetag Gottes die Rede ist. Die Botschaft von der Erlösung überwiegt. Doch daß dies nur die eine Seite der Predigt Jesu (das „süße Evangelium") war, zeigt sich darin, daß auf den Freudentaumel der Nazarener die harte Ankündigung folgt: „Ihr werdet freilich zu mir sagen" usw. Jetzt kam der Umschwung; mit der Freude war es aus; Zorn und Mordlust erfüllt die Herzen. Denn die frommen und patriotischen Nazarener wollten ihren alten Sinn nicht fahren lassen, ihr böses Herz nicht ändern. Und doch hat Jesus die Forderung der Sinnesänderung auf das Genaueste mit seiner Freudenbotschaft verknüpft. Hier schauen wir einen Hintergrund andrer Art; hinter Jesu schwebt das süße Geheimnis der Ueberwelt, das aber zugleich ein heiliges ist; hinter den Menschen dehnt sich ein böser Abgrund, dessen Dünste ihren Sinn umnebeln und ihr Herz vergiften, so daß die frohe Botschaft ohne den Ernst der Sinnesänderung einem furchtbaren Mißverständnis ausgesetzt ist.

„Und glaubet an das Evangelium." Die frohe Botschaft meldet eine erstaunliche Wendung der Zeit zum Guten, und ihr jesajanischer Wortlaut, verbunden mit der Zusicherung: „Heute ist diese Schrift erfüllt vor euren Ohren," mußte ja die Nazarener mit jauchzender Freude erfüllen; in kürzester Frist sind da alte Hoffnungen wieder aufgelebt, Hoffnungen politischer, sozialer und religiöser Art; aber wie geistlos und irdisch sie waren, zeigt das schließliche Verhalten jener Zuhörer Jesu gegenüber. Da ist es denn wichtig, daß Markus uns das Wort vom Glauben aufbewahrt hat. Wenn Jesus die Menschen zum Glauben mahnt, dann ist das doch ein Beweis dafür, daß er selbst an die Möglichkeit glaubt, daß die Menschen zum Glauben kommen; und in dieser Aufforderung liegt bereits eine Beihilfe zum Glauben für alle die, die Jesu gegenüber etwas von dem Hintergrund ahnen. Dieser Umstand weist darauf hin, daß in den Menschen selbst ein Anknüpfungspunkt für Jesu Predigt liegen müsse; auch dies gehört mit zum Hintergrund.

Zusammenfassend dürfen wir sagen: Hinter der Reichspredigt steht der Prediger selbst, der doch mehr ist als nur „Die Stimme eines Rufenden"; durch seine Worte wirkt die Kraft des Redenden, der die neue Zeit herbeiführt, in dem und mit dem das Gottesreich in Welt und Zeit eintritt und der, dem bösen Hintergrund gegenüber, sowohl Sinnesänderung verlangt als auch Glauben

erwartet, also auch das Gute schaut, so schwach es auch dem Bösen gegenüber auftritt.

Der Reichskönig. Hier kommen wir mit der „Religion" Jesu nicht mehr durch. Auf der einen Seite redet er von dem Reich Gottes, bezeichnet also Gott als den Reichskönig; auf der andern nimmt er für sich selbst eine Autorität in Anspruch und schreibt sich eine Stellung zu, die mit Gottes Stellung und Autorität zu rivalieren scheinen.

Es ist schon auffallend, daß Jesus sich nicht ohne weiteres mit den andern Menschen zusammenschließt, so zum Beispiel in der Bergpredigt: „Euer himmlischer Vater." Dies fällt besonders ins Gewicht, wenn man die Vorliebe bedenkt, mit der er sich selbst als des Menschen Sohn bezeichnet. Warum vermeidet er da die Redensart: unser himmlischer Vater? Dazu kommt, daß er schon als Zwölfjähriger verwundert fragt: „Wisset ihr nicht, daß ich sein muß in dem, das meines Vaters ist?" Damit meint er ja Gott, den er also als seinen Vater ganz besonders für sich in Anspruch nimmt. In einem wichtigen Punkt stellt er sich allen andern durchaus entgegen: „Ihr, die ihr doch arg seid."

Jesus tritt mit großer Sicherheit auf und mit ganz außergewöhnlicher Autorität; er behauptet von seinen Worten, sie würden Himmel und Erde überdauern. Seine Auslegung des väterlichen Gesetzes sei die allein richtige, ebenso seine Anschauung vom Sabbath, obwohl sie der herrschenden auf das Schärfste widerspricht. Er stellt sich über Mose, Jonah, Elias, David und Salomo; er verlangt, die Menschen müßten die natürliche Zuneigung zu den Blutsverwandten hinter die Liebe zu ihm zurücktreten lassen; wer überhaupt nicht ausdrücklich auf seine Seite sich schlage, sei sein Feind, und wie es solchen Leuten gehe, lassen Sprüche wie dieser erkennen: „Wer mich verleugnet" usw. Ja, er bringt ein zukünftiges Gericht in engen Zusammenhang mit seiner Person; er selbst werde in den Wolken des Himmels kommen mit großer Macht und Herrlichkeit. Er werde dann einem jeglichen vergelten nach seinen Werken. Zugrundegehen müsse, wer seinen Worten nicht nachlebe, wer ihn nur mit den Lippen bekenne, wer sogar in seinem Namen große Taten getan hätte, wenn er nämlich versäumte, den Willen seines himmlischen Vaters zu tun. Solche Menschen würden als Uebeltäter von ihm verstoßen werden. Umgekehrt sei jeder, der den Willen Gottes tue, ihm (Jesu) verwandt.

Darum vergleicht er sich den Menschen gegenüber mit einem Bräutigam. Wer ihn habe, brauche nicht zu fasten. Er rief alle von der Last des Lebens Niedergebeugten, alle von seinen Nöten Umgetriebenen zu sich, damit sie bei ihm Ausspannung und Ruhe fänden, und er vergibt sogar Sünden. Seine Aufgabe bestehe darin, die Sünder zur Buße zu rufen und das Verlorene zu retten, ja

seine Seele, das heißt sein Leben, seine eigene Person für die Rettung vieler einzusetzen und hinzugeben, also ganz in ihrem Dienst aufzugehen, bis in den Tod hinein.

Zunächst handle es sich freilich darum, guten Samen auszustreuen, das heißt die Erkenntnis des wahren Gottes und seines Willens zu verbreiten und sich selber den Seelen anzupreisen, damit sie glauben und also nicht verloren gehen. Wer so ihn, Jesum, aufnehme, der nehme den auf, der ihn gesandt habe, das heißt Gott. Damit beansprucht er eine zwischen Gott und den Menschen vermittelnde Stellung. Außer ihm kennten nur die den Vater, denen er zu solcher Erkenntnis verholfen habe. Alle Dinge seien ihm vom Vater übergeben.

Dabei gab sich Jesus keiner Täuschung hin: Nicht alle würden sich retten lassen. So kann er sogar sagen, er sei gekommen, um das Schwert unter die Menschen zu senden. Damit weist er auf seine kritische Bedeutung hin; sein Wort müsse unter den Menschen rumoren und eine tiefgehende Spaltung verursachen.

Es ist gar kein Zweifel: Jesus hat von sich als dem Messias und Sohn Gottes gesprochen; er bekennt sich zu Petri Bekenntnis und läßt in den letzten Unterredungen mit seinen Gegnern durchblicken, er sei der Messias und Davids Herr; vor dem ganzen Volk erklärt er, es habe nur einen Meister, nämlich den Messias, womit er sich selbst meinte. In der Passahzeit setzt er das heilige Abendmahl ein, wobei er Worte spricht, die diese Handlung für immer auf die feierlichste Weise mit seiner Person und seinem Werk verknüpfen; er versichert den Petrus seiner wirksamen Fürbitte, beschwört im Gericht seines Volkes seine Messianität und prophezeit sein Kommen in Herrlichkeit, unbeschadet der andern Verheißung, er werde bei seinen Jüngern sein allezeit. Er behauptet, ihm sei im Himmel und auf Erden alle Gewalt gegeben, und darum sollten die Jünger in alle Welt hinausgehen, lehren und taufen. Im Taufbefehl verknüpft er seinen Namen auf das Engste mit dem des Vaters, beziehungsweise dem des Heiligen Geistes, und im Gleichnis vom Endgericht spricht er deutlich von sich selbst als dem Gerichtskönig, der das ewige Geschick der Menschen zu entscheiden habe.

So hat sich also Jesus auf eine Weise, die vielen Menschen höchst anstößig und ärgerlich ist (darum nicht von Menschen erfunden) mit Gott, dem König des Reiches, zusammengeschlossen. Hat er sich Gott gleich gesetzt? Man denke noch einmal an das schon angeführte Wort: „Wer mich aufnimmt, der nimmt den auf, der mich gesandt hat." Und nun kommt wieder etwas Ueberraschendes: Jesus behauptet ausdrücklich, sein himmlischer Vater habe allein das Recht, die Ehrenstellen im Reich Gottes zu vergeben; der Vater allein wisse die Stunde des Weltunterganges, und dem Willen Gottes habe sich jeder zu unterwerfen — auch der Sohn? Er hat

es jedenfalls getan: „Nicht mein, sondern dein Wille geschehe." Das ist das Grundgesetz im Gottesreich, wie es sich dort überall im Leben ausgeprägt, wo die Reichsgesinnung zu finden ist.

Die Reichsgesinnung. Will man ein Jünger Jesu werden, so muß man sich selbst und die nächsten Anverwandten, ja alle Menschen und alles in gewissem Sinne hassen, das heißt verleugnen, insofern nämlich allem irdischen die Sünde anklebt. Dann aber bekommt man die Kraft zu binden und zu lösen; man hat die rechte Urteilskraft inbezug auf die ewigen Dinge und kann in Jesu Sinn und Namen handeln. Wer sich selbst verleugnet und alles, was ihn von Gott trennt, der hat ihm gegenüber die rechte Stellung gewonnen, so daß nun Vergebung und Glaube möglich wird, aber immer im Zusammenhang mit Jesus. Jetzt gilt: „Wer euch höret, der höret mich und wer euch aufnimmt, der nimmt mich auf." Solche Menschen sind die wahren Wohltäter, die wahren Herrscher der Welt; sie herrschen durch Dienen, durch werktätige Liebe. Ihre Namen sind im Himmel angeschrieben. Ihnen sind als Gläubigen alle Dinge möglich, und mit ihnen schließt sich Jesus zum Beispiel in dem Spruch zusammen: „Wer nicht wider uns ist, der ist für uns." Solange die Welt, das heißt alle die Menschen, die noch nicht Jünger Jesu geworden sind, diese in Ruhe lassen, dienen sie, ohne das gerade zu wissen und zu wollen, den Zwecken des Reiches Gottes.

Endlich ein Wort aus Jesu Mund für das Vorhandensein des Gewissens: „Warum richtet ihr nicht von euch selber, was recht ist?" Hierzu nehmen wir die Wertschätzung des Kindlichen vonseiten Jesu und seine Hinweisung auf das Licht in uns, womit neben der Offenbarung besonders die Vernunft gemeint ist. Diese drei Dinge: Kindlicher Sinn, Vernunft und Gewissen sind Anknüpfungspunkte für den Uebergang in die Jüngerschaft; trotz der Sünde ist im Menschen noch etwas, an das Jesus sich wenden kann. Es ist ein Appell an die kindliche Güte des Menschen, sowie an ihr Gefühl für Recht und Unrecht, ein Appell an das Licht der Menschenvernunft, wenn Jesus sie zur Sinnesänderung aufruft.

Die Sinnesänderung. Da die Menschen arg, das heißt schlecht sind, also Sünder, so dürfen sie nicht bleiben, wie sie sind. Sie müssen von ihrem alten Sinn lassen, der als Unglaube und Weltliebe dem Willen Gottes, der uns retten und beseligen will, widerspricht. Man muß sich selbst und die Welt verleugnen, das heißt das Recht auf die Existenz absprechen, damit man die Wurzel der Sünde abschneidet, nämlich den auf sich, den Menschen, und die Welt gerichteten Sinn. Was Jesus hier fordert, wird uns sofort klar, wenn wir untersuchen, wie er sich zu den zwei Grundtrieben des Menschen stellte, dem Selbsterhaltungs- und dem Gattungstrieb.

Wenn Jesus verlangt: „Ihr sollt euch nicht Schätze sammeln

auf Erden," so fragt es sich, ob er diesen wuchtigen Schlag gegen den Selbsterhaltungstrieb in der Meinung tut, es habe doch keinen Wert, das dem Tod verfallene Leben zu erhalten. Das ist jedoch ausgeschlossen; denn er setzt hinzu: „Sammelt euch aber Schätze im Himmel." Damit ist also ausgesprochen, daß das irdische Leben trotz seiner Vergänglichkeit (oder wegen ihr) ausgenützt werden kann und soll mit Rücksicht auf das himmlische Leben. Abgesehen davon hat es keinen vernünftigen Sinn und keinen bleibenden Wert. Der Schnitt, den Jesus hier macht, geht tief und tut weh. Hier gibt es keinen Kompromiß: „Ihr könnt nicht Gott dienen und dem Mammon." Wer sein (sinnlich-selbstsüchtiges) Leben sucht, muß es verlieren.

So wenig Jesus den Selbstmord anrät, ebenso wenig verlangt er geschlechtliche Enthaltsamkeit. Er besteht aber, wie wir schon einmal erwähnt haben, auf der Unverletzlichkeit der monogamischen Ehe und rechnet die Hurerei kurzerhand zu den bösen Dingen, die aus dem menschlichen Herzen stammen. Das Elend sitzt im Herzen: „Wer ein Eheweib ansieht, ihrer zu begehren" usw. Kinder sind wahrhaftig ein Gottessegen; denn ihrer ist das Himmelreich; aber die populäre Meinung, man könne nicht enthaltsam leben, widerlegt er durch den Hinweis auf jene, die sich um des Himmelreiches willen verschnitten haben, wie auch durch sein eigen Beispiel.

Zusammenfassend können wir sagen: Einerlei ob man im Stand der Ehe lebt oder ehelos, das irdische Leben hat (das gilt auch für das Schätzesammeln) seinen Schwerpunkt im himmlischen. Darnach richtet man sich bei der Sinnesänderung; das kann man aber ohne Glauben nicht vollbringen.

Der Glaube. Worte und Taten Jesu zielten auf den Glauben. Glauben haben bedeutet aber im Sinn Jesu Verzicht auf die eigene Kraft und vertrauensvolle Hingabe an Gott (und seinen Gesandten, den Jesum von Nazareth; hier weist die „Religion" Jesu wieder über sich hinaus). In den einzelnen Fällen zeigt sich eine Fülle von Eigenart. Kannst du, willst du mit mir ein Leben in Entbehrung führen, ohne ein eigenes Dach über dem Kopf zu haben? Oder: Halte dich nicht damit auf, deinem Vater die letzte Ehre zu erweisen. Oder: Schaue dich nicht mehr um, wenn du deine Hand an den Pflug gelegt hast. Wer nicht mit mir ist, ist wider mich: Es gilt eine große Scheidung und Entscheidung; anders gibt es keinen Glauben.

Diese ist überall dort (für Jesum), für Gott gefallen, wo sich echte Demut und aufrichtige Hingabe an ihn findet. Darum lobte Jesus den Hauptmann zu Kapernaum, der sich ebenso unter Jesu Autorität beugte, wie er Aehnliches von seinen Knechten und Untergebenen verlangte, nämlich, daß sie sich ihm, ihrem Vorgesetzten, unterstellten.

In andern Fällen führte Jesus eine Krisis herbei: Dem Gichtbrüchigen vergibt er die Sünden, und der war doch nicht zu diesem Zweck herbeigeschafft worden. Er murrt nicht; so bestand er die Probe. „Es ist nicht fein, daß man den Kindern das Brot nehme" usw. „Ja, Herr, aber doch" usw.: Das Weiblein hat sich ganz unter Jesum gestellt, und das „aber doch" war nicht Anmaßung, sondern Glaube; aus Not und Mutterliebe geboren, bewährte er sich in der Demut und kindlicher Zuversicht.

Merkwürdig ist die Art, wie Jesus den Jüngern auf ihre Bitte hin den Glauben stärkt. Er verlangt das den Menschen Unmögliche und bekämpft die Meinung, als wäre Gott uns etwas schuldig. Also: Erwarte von Gott das den Menschen Unmögliche und diene ihm mit demütigem Herzen. Von hier aus ist bis zur Liebe nur ein kleiner Schritt.

Die Liebe. Ehe die Menschen Gott lieben können, müssen ihre Sünden vergeben sein, und da Gott ihr Vorbild, ja ihr Vater ist, so kann von ihnen auch die Feindesliebe erwartet werden. Die Liebe zu Gott schließt alle Liebe in sich; sie ist die lebendige Grundlage der Gesetzeserfüllung nach ihren beiden Seiten hin: Gott und dem Nächsten gegenüber. Das Maß der Liebe zum Nächsten ist die Liebe zur eigenen Persönlichkeit, das heißt wir sollen unsern Nächsten ebenso innig lieben, wie uns selbst, und auf ebendieselbe Weise, das heißt unsre Liebe zu uns selbst ist auch ein Muster für die Art und Weise, in der wir den andern lieben sollen: „Alles, das ihr wollt, daß euch die Leute tun sollen, so tut ihnen auch."

Sofern aber an allen Sünde ist, und darum die Gefahr der falschen Liebe, der Abgötterei, besteht, gilt das Wort: „Wer Vater oder Mutter usw. mehr liebt als mich (!), ist mein nicht wert." Wer sich gar Jesu und seiner Worte schämt, der wird am Ende, wenn er in seiner Herrlichkeit offenbar wird, selbst zuschanden werden (hier kommen wir mit der „Religion" Jesu wahrhaftig nicht mehr durch). Treues Festhalten an Jesu und seinem Wort, Richtung des Herzens auf das Ewige, das Reich Gottes, und wachsamer Sinn, der sich in gewissenhaftem Tun des göttlichen Willens bewährt, mit einem Wort: Das Leben in Hoffnung der Vollendung, das allein bewahrt vor einem Ende in Schmach und Schande.

Die Hoffnung. Sie ist wesentlich der auf das Jenseits (die Ueberwelt) gerichtete Sinn. Insofern, als das Reich Gottes noch nicht vollendet ist, geht sie freilich auf die Zukunft. Insofern jedoch (mit Jesus!) das Ewige bereits in die zeitliche Erscheinung getreten ist, hat sie eine ausgesprochene Bedeutung für die Gegenwart: Sie sieht über das Aermliche der Jetztzeit hinweg und hilft darüber hinweg, immer in der Gewißheit der Vollendung und im Blick auf die Verantwortung. Darum kann der irdische Sinn sie nur mißverstehen als schwärmerischen Optimismus, oder aber er verachtet

sie in resigniertem Pessimismus. Jesus selbst weiß, daß die von ihm ausgestreute Saat zur Reife gelangen werde, und der Blick auf das irdische Ende seines Lebens in Not und Tod hat ihn nie davon abgehalten, gerade dieses Ende zu suchen; aber leicht ist es ihm nicht geworden. Er hat die Kosten gewissenhaft zum Voraus überschlagen und dabei auch für seine Jünger gesorgt.

So hat es die Hoffnung mit dem Ewigen zu tun, das in der Zeit verwirklicht werden soll, doch ohne seine Eigenart zu verlieren. So allein kann das Reich Gottes die Welt überwinden, ja, was noch mehr heißen will, die Welt verklären.

Das Reich selbst. Es fehlen weder der Predigt Jesu vom Reich noch diesem selbst die Anknüpfungspunkte. Wir haben gesehen, wie er in seiner Bibel lebte und zuhause war, wie er seine eigene Persönlichkeit entfaltete in stetem Zusammenhang mit Gottes geoffenbartem Wort. Der Schauplatz dieser Entfaltung ist die alltägliche Wirklichkeit. Hier findet er auch die Anknüpfungspunkte für das Himmelreich. Er sucht und findet Menschen, die sich unter Gott (und ihn) stellen. Sie sind wesentlich Menschen, die des Lebens Not und Betrug erfahren haben und sich nach etwas Besserem sehnen; es sind die Verachteten, die Unglücklichen, die Bescheidenen, die Entbehrenden usw.; sie sind recht eigentlich die Hoffnung der Welt. Sobald sie den Anschluß an Jesum gefunden haben, sind sie das Salz der Erde, das Licht der Welt. Sie sind die Empfänglichen, die Jesu gegenüber ihr Herz nicht verstocken, der gute Same, die Kinder des Reiches. Sie sind die Einfältigen, deren Augen nicht zugleich nach dem Irdischen und dem Ewigen schielen. Sie, deren Seelen unter der Last des Lebens sich abarbeiten; sie, die Gott gegenüber (gerade auch im öffentlichen Gottesdienst) nur an ihre Sünde und Unwürdigkeit denken; sie, die durch Gottes Güte in die Buße geführt werden — sie werden sofort hellhörig, wenn sie Jesu Reichspredigt vernehmen.

Und die andern? Es scheint, als wären sie einfach die Verworfenen, denen Gott selbst den Weg in das Reich verrammelt hätte. Aber in Wirklichkeit liegen die Dinge nicht so einfach. Wir finden, wie wir bereits betont haben, bei Jesus den Appell an die den Menschen möglichen Güte, die Vatergüte, den Kindessinn, Vernunft und Gewissen. Das finstere Geheimnis der menschlichen Schlechtigkeit vermag dem Prediger das Gute im Menschen nicht zuzudecken. Vernunft und Gewissen sind Jesu nicht einfach abstrakte Begriffe oder Dinge, die dem Menschen in religiöser Hinsicht kurzerhand abzusprechen wären, lebendige Anlagen, ohne die der Mensch nicht Mensch ist. Freilich, was haben wir daraus gemacht, daß er uns im Bausch und Bogen mit dem Zeugnis „Arg" beschämen muß! Auch kennt Jesus wohl den kosmischen Zusammenhang der Dinge; denn er redet ohne Zögern und Entschuldigung vom Teufel.

Wir haben bereits darauf hingewiesen, wie hoch Jesus die Menschenseele einschätzt. Gott ist unser Vater: Darin liegt unsre Würde begründet, die uns hoch über alle andern Lebewesen hinaushebt. Darum legt er auf den kindlichen Sinn ein solch großes Gewicht; in ihm hat das Reich seinen ganz großen Anknüpfungspunkt.

Die angemessene Wertschätzung des individuellen Menschenlebens (mit Einschluß des Weibes und des Kindes) sind wichtige Merkmale der Reichspredigt; daraus folgt, wie man mit seinem Nächsten umgeht und ihn behandelt, das ist eine Sache, die direkte Bedeutung für das Reich Gottes hat. Damit ist eigentlich ausgedrückt, daß Religion und Politik im tiefsten Grund zusammengehören. Und doch kennt Jesus den Riß, der gerade auch in diesem Stück durch unser Leben hindurchgeht: „Ihr könnet nicht Gott und dem Mammon dienen." Er kennt den Betrug des Reichtums und weigert sich als Richter oder Erbschlichter zu fungieren. Die Reichen können nur schwer in das Reich eingehen; es hilft da nur ein Mittel: Die Treue im rechten Gebrauch der Güter und des Geldes. Wer nicht einmal mit dem Geld recht umgehen kann, wer also im Kleinen, im Irdischen, nicht treu ist, wie soll dem Gott das Größere, das Himmelreich, anvertrauen.

Der sogenannte weltliche Staat, in dem unsre Finanzwirtschaft zusammengefaßt und garantiert ist, wird von Jesus nur milde und beiläufig kritisiert („So soll es bei euch nicht sein," siehe weiter unten). Wie gewaltig greift er dagegen die geistliche Obrigkeit an. Aber die heidnische hatte kein Messiasideal, noch dazu ein verweltlichtes; sie allein hätte ihn auch nicht gekreuzigt. Der Schaden für Gottes Reich war in „Gottes Volk" angerichtet, und hiefür waren seine Führer und Beamte verantwortlich, die von einem irdischen Reich träumten in fleischlichem Wohlergehen und weltlicher Macht und Pracht. Darum hat Jesus alle Kirchenpolitik dieser Art für immer verurteilt. Im Weltreich lebt man, um zu sterben; im Gottesreich stirbt man, um zu leben.

(Schluß folgt.)

EDITORIALS

October 27, 1927.

To the Editor:

The drift toward unification of Protestantism is unmistakable. While no church union embracing all denominations is in sight there has been a considerable consolidation of smaller denominations. If this tendency continues what will be the position of our Synod in the future?

It is now ten years ago that three Lutheran bodies united to form the United Lutheran church. That union absorbed one body, the General Synod, which was probably closer to us in religious feeling than any other church body. The temper of the General synod is no longer evident in the United Lutheran church. Some years ago there was some thought in a few circles of our church about the possibility of union with the United Lutheran church. There has been no evidence of such interest in late years. The United Lutheran church is a progressive church with tremendous energy, but its spirit is illiberal. Hundreds of our pastors and congregations would never find it possible to join this group.

The only other group remaining with which we have any common heritage is the *Reformed church.* Its membership is drawn from the same kind of people as our own and its whole temper is very similar to our own. Never as Calvinistic as the Presbyterian churches there is now so little to divide us from a group such as the Reformed people that there is no justification for separate establishments. The Reformed church may in time be drawn into a Presbyterian reunion. It might in fact prefer such a union, to one with us. But there is no certainty that it would. At least there are some elements in the church which would most certainly prefer a union with us. At least there would be no harm in occasional informal conversations between unofficial representatives to explore each others minds.

A *union* with *the Reformed church* would create a denomination of some six hundred thousand communicants. A denomination of this size could carry on its missionary and educational tasks with much less waste than our respective denominations under present conditions. There would be more than this advantage in union however. A union of the two churches would bring fresh life and inspiration to both parties. It would result in a denomination which could make a real contribution to American church life.

Perhaps the idea is a wild one. When suggested some years ago by the present writer in the pages of this magazine it was hailed with derision. There is good reason however to believe that the present temper of the church is not so unsympathetic toward the proposal. At any rate the "Magazine" might render a real service to the church by exploring the problem of union and inviting the opinion of the ministers of the synod upon it.

R. Niebuhr.

THE CONFESSIONAL PARAGRAPH AT THE GENERAL CONFERENCE

The special General Conference of October last adopted the Confessional Paragraph in the somewhat remodeled form suggested by the Revision Committee. The changes of this committee had to do only with the language and arrangement of the paragraph. They aimed to give its rather involved sentences greater simplicity and clarity; they did not affect its theology at all.

Still it could not be said that this change in phraseology was all that anybody wanted. There was noticeable a distinct undercurrent of opinion which would have liked to go further. If nothing was accomplished along this line it was not because no one felt the desire of a change but because few, if any, knew exactly what to propose. The point where some had a vague idea that a revision might be advisable was where the confessional paragraph "acknowledges the symbolical books of the Lutheran and Reformed churches" and mentions "the Augsburg Confession, Luther's and the Heidelberg Catechism" by name. This seems to limit us to the adherents of the two churches named and to raise a barrier against members of other churches that might want to join with us or whom we might try to win.

The Confessional Paragraph, so it is said, reflects a historical situation that was found in Prussia 100 years ago, and is still there, and a situation which our fathers in the faith faced, 85 years ago, when they transplanted the Prussian Union church on to American soil, but it is not the situation our church is confronted with today. As long as our language was German, our approach might naturally be only to the members of the two communions that flourished in Germany. Since, however, our church has become almost wholly English, or is getting to be so, we must adjust ourselves to new conditions and get ready for greater tasks. We cannot confine ourselves any more to either Lutherans or Reformed:

we ought to be willing, and even eager, to receive any applicant who sees in Christ his Redeemer, be he Congregationalist, Disciple, Episcopalian, or what not.

We, so goes the argument, are the church that of all American communions ought to stress the union idea most emphatically, for we adopted a union platform when no one else had yet thought of it. The tendency of the churches to get together is a triumph of the principle upheld by our fathers. Our union, indeed, was one of Lutherans and Reformed only, but if a common church has room for these two main branches of the Reformation movement, why not for others? For us now to hesitate to take the larger view would be a case of arrested development and might cost us whatever advantage the foresight of our fathers, or providential circumstances, have gained for us.

And if such enlargement of program is our present policy, why not indicate it in our confessional paragraph? Reflections like these were contained in the President General's report to the district conference of last year. One or two districts, at least, felt induced to take a step in this direction by moving that, after the clause in the paragraph "acknowledges the symbolical books of the Lutheran and Reformed" be inserted, "and other Protestant bodies." Other districts have been slow to suggest changes in this respect, nor has the revision committee proposed any. Doubtless the insertion of "and other churches" (or bodies) would be most unfortunate, on account of its indefiniteness. One would at once ask, *what* other churches? Certainly, not all churches would be included. Therefore, only a clearcut statement could serve the purpose. In a confessional paragraph there is no room for hazy, ambiguous generalities.

But, so we ask, if instead of "other churches," we said "all other churches acknowledging Christ, the Son of God, as their Redeemer," would that be an improvement on the old paragraph and more in harmony with present-day policy? The answer is not as easy as it might seem. For instance, Baptists and Disciples might fall in that category but they reject Infant Baptism and it would hardly do to unite in one church pedo-baptists and anti-pedo-baptists. Among the believers in Infant Baptism we have the Methodists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Episcopalians, to mention only the larger bodies. It would scarcely be desirable to enumerate these by name in the Confessional Paragraph, for such enumeration would ipso facto be an exclusion of all the others. Besides, since the paragraph records our agreement with the Lutherans *and* the *Reformed,* the churches mentioned are included for they are branches of the Reformed Church. And our Confessional Para-

graph has in the past never been an obstacle to our receiving individual members from other Protestant churches.

There is another thing which must not be lost sight of in this connection. We must remember we have a *Catechism.* This catechism is a product of the Union spirit, it is a combination of Lutheran and Reformed elements, the Lutheran strain preponderating. If we, in the teaching of the young, use this textbook, it takes no notice of Methodists, Presbyterians and so forth. It raises even, in some respects, the bars against the inflowing of foreign elements. It has a definite teaching on the atonement while the American churches, being mostly without confessional authorities, are subject to every shifting wind of doctrine. It teaches that the sacraments are means of grace; to the others they are mere symbols and memorials. Churches with a catechism believe in indoctrinating, i. e. that there are certain things a church must believe in and stand for; churches without a catechism are like the rudderless vessel tossed by the turbulent sea.

If we change our paragraph in the manner suggested we shall soon need a new catechism or else will have to tone down some of its statements and of our beliefs in order to adjust ourselves to those reared in other environments.

Now it is true enough that many of us are not satisfied with the catechism and the ordinary way of catechism instruction. They contend that what the children need is not doctrinal teaching but religious training; they need spiritual experience and guidance as to how they can take their place in the congregation's worship and activities. We are heartily in accord with that view. Even in Germany we find that same movement. Only lately we discussed a new handbook which has that practical aim rather than mere drilling in the catechism. (Seim, Ev. Gem. leben) But the author of it gives the essential doctrines of the creed its place.

So, on the whole, we are of the opinion that it would be wise to go slowly. No one and nothing hinders us to build into our churches suitable material wherever found; we don't need a new confessional paragraph to do this.

One more feature to which the discussion about the paragraph led we want to make mention of before closing. It was pointed out that our paragraph, while declaring our faith in the Old and New Testaments, does not contain a positive statement of what our belief is. This was surprising to some, and a motion was made and adopted, that a committee of nine be appointed which is to submit a brief statement of our faith to next year's district conferences.

"SAVING THE CITY"

The other night I attended a special service arranged for by the Baptist Association of this city, for the purpose of raising funds for home mission work here in Cleveland. I want to report on this meeting for two reasons: 1) to introduce to our readers the speaker of the evening, Geo. W. Truett, minister of the First Baptist Church of Dallas, Texas, and 2) to give an idea of how the Baptists raise funds for missionary causes.

My assumption that our ministers will be glad to get acquainted with this particular clergyman is based on the fact that he was voted one of the "25 leading ministers of the country," in the poll of the "Christian Century," three years ago. *Dr. Geo. W. Truett* is a man of about 55 years and has been pastor of his present church for 31 years. I did not notice anything particularly striking about his personality. He was introduced as "one of the most noted speakers of the world and as a prophet of God." This rather broad statement he seemed to take meekly, perhaps as one of the conventional exaggerations of introduction speeches. He began in a low, conversational tone, but after a while he warmed up and developed a good deal of vehemence. The large audience—about 2000 people—and the sound of his own voice had their psychological effect on him. He gathered too much momentum and was unable to check himself. It was not so much a question of too much speed, but he began to declaim; and from now on he could not modulate his voice sufficiently to relieve the tension and make attention easier by a change of tone. It would be ungracious to judge of a speaker's ability by one address. Still this writer, acknowledging elements of strength in Truett's way of presenting things, felt that he was not living up to his reputation. Only once when he told a very touching story, did I notice in myself a certain melting of soul.

That does not mean, however, that there were not a good many strong points in the speech. American fashion, Dr. Truett chose for his subject a rather pretentious title. His subject was, *Saving the City;* not raising money for starting mission churches. To save the city, he said, is the great problem before the church today for the city is the nerve center as well as the storm center. And just as the soul in man is greater than the body, just so is it more important for the city to have a soul and save it, than the advancement of industry. Spiritual things are always higher than material. Tennyson, he claimed, when he wrote his "Crossing the Bar" did more for civilization than if he had built a thousand ocean liners. The highest spiritual values are religious values. Faith in God, in Christ, is a creative power. Every great believer

is a great doer. Faith is valuable if, and when, it lifts, enriches, sweetens, betters life. To follow Jesus means magnitude of soul; it gives vision, broadens horizons, creates ideals, bestows life.

The way to test a man is to ask him, what is your conception of life? To many it consists in material or even intellectual possessions. There he told a story of a miser who had lived on charity and who was later discovered to have left 3 millions of dollars. I thought the speaker was laying it on a little thick right there.

Then he presented the other extreme of men prodigals in the spending of money and life itself. Another story followed of a man who had invited his friends to give them a sensation. He jumped from a bridge into the swirling waters below: the suicide was the sensation.

Rather strong stuff, I thought again. Why select such extraordinary cases? The right conception of life is that of trusteeship, continued the speaker. I owe myself, my life to God, to humanity. Like Paul I ought to feel a debtor to the world. Another gruesome story was told, of a man who had lived to himself, amassed millions, and on his deathbed moaned: "It has come at last, I am broke and far from home!" And although his family showed him that his money and securities were all there, he kept repeating that heart-rending cry; and so he passed out.

Very sad, indeed, but overdone again, I felt. Now the speaker turned to the immediate task before him. Our time, he said, is one of momentous changes. Distance is wiped out. The world is becoming one big whispering gallery (He told us here that one wrote him from London, England, that he had heard his, Truett's sermon, over the radio, as plainly as though he had sat in one of Truett's front pews). And physical unity spells also spiritual unity. Such days as these call for big men. Woe to the city, and country, whose leaders are small men! We need the same devotion we showed during the last war. Then he rehearsed some of the scenes of that stirring time, which showed, incidentally, that his war idealism had not been affected by post-war developments and literature. Some have said, he went on, Christianity failed in the war. No, he replied, diplomacy failed, big business failed, education failed in the war; the only thing that did not fail was Christianity. It is for us, therefore, to use the gospel of Christ for the saving of the city, and for the Baptists of Cleveland, in particular, to rise to their opportunity and subscribe the $400,000 needed in the present campaign.

He told one of his campaign experiences, where a young couple had given their new little home for the purpose of liquidating the debt on the church. When he told that, the melting we spoke of

before took place. But not only in the writer's heart, but in the whole audience. And not only there; no, the speaker told us that the spirit of Christ and his cross (i e. of sacrifice) was so powerfully present in that audience in Texas that great numbers were pricked in their hearts and asked that old question, what must I do to be saved?

The reader of these lines may feel as though the writer had been amused by Truett's address rather than stirred and edified. That is not so, though. It is true, however, that his stories would not go so well with our people. I don't think they are quite as emotional as that Baptist audience. They like stories, but stories that sound as though they might have happened, not fairy tales or stories that happen only once in a million times.

Nevertheless our Mission Boards, or Boards of Promotion, or any other Board that desires to raise funds, might learn from these Baptists. We see when they wanted money for new churches, for pastor's salaries and for facilities, they sent for one of their big men, who was a specialist in money-raising. And he put his particular task within a large setting. He said we want to save this city, i. e., we want to do our share in saving it. And then he went about and raised the money himself. At the end of the one day those Baptists had between 150-200,000 dollars, almost 50 percent of the amount to be obtained.

We haven't many men who could do that. But we would have more if we could find it in us to give outstanding men their due need of praise. The Baptists—and others—believe in the *mutual admiration principle.* They speak well of one another. They go to excess in it, perhaps, but they get results. We are always afraid to make our men vain. Our parishioners, too, are of the same type. They seldom tell us that our sermons helped them. That is good in one way: we are saved from the temptations of fishing for compliments. It is bad, however, in another way: we don't get encouragement.

Still our Boards might say we don't believe in these high-power methods. In that case nothing is left for us to do but to try the way of well planned, persistently carried-out and ultimately successful education.

Zur „Captatio Benevolentiae."

Als die Zeitschriftenbehörde vor einem Jahr beschloß, im „Magazin" dem Englischen die erste Stelle zu geben, war das Echo aus dem deutschen Lager kein erfreuliches. Alte, treue Leser fühlten sich tief gekränkt und schrieben uns und dem Verlag entrüstete Briefe. Es schien ihnen ein Zeichen von Undankbarkeit gegen diejenigen zu sein, die das „Magazin" in der Vergangenheit so treu

unterstützt hatten. Einer der Opponenten machte seinem Herzen in dieser Weise Luft: „Ich habe des „Magazin" (oder die „Theologische Zeitschrift") 38 Jahre gelesen, zwischen uns ist stets die beste Freundschaft gewesen, aber nun will ich es nicht mehr!" Wir haben damals zu unserm großen Leidwesen eine ziemlich erhebliche Anzahl von Lesern verloren.

Seitdem ist nun ein Jahr verflossen, und die Leser haben wahrnehmen können, daß der deutsche Teil, obwohl an die zweite Stelle zurück, doch durchaus nicht stiefmütterlich behandelt worden ist. Die Artikel von Professor Grützmacher sind regelmäßig erschienen. Dieselben sind unsers Erachtens allein den Preis des Blattes wert. Wer die Nummern sämtlich aufbewahrt, oder noch besser, wer sie sich einbinden läßt ($1.50 im Verlagshaus), hat eine kurzgefaßte Dogmatik positiver Observanz. Im neuen Jahr wird Herr Professor Grützmacher in sechs Nummern eine **Geschichte der verschiedenen deutschen theologischen Schulen seit Schleiermacher** geben. Was könnte interessanter und zeitgemäßer sein für den, der im Drang der Geschäfte und im Wechsel der Zeiten den Faden der Orientierung nicht aus der Hand lassen will!

Wer also jetzt dem Blatt den Rücken kehrt, der verliert in der Tat viel, von den andern deutschen Darbietungen des Jahres ganz zu geschweigen. Damit auch die uns zeitweilig untreu Gewordenen nicht ohne Kenntnis der Sachlage bleiben, lassen wir diese Nummer an die Adresse aller unsrer Pastoren ausgehen.

Und noch eins erwähnen wir, um die „benevolentia" unsrer deutschen Leser zu gewinnen und festzuhalten. Bei uns stellen die alten, deutschen Leser den theologisch konservativen Teil dar. Sie repräsentieren die Orthodoxie der Väter. Aus dem englischen, resp. amerikanischen Lager kommen — freilich meist auf dem Weg über Deutschland — die vorwärtsschreitenden, modernen Anregungen und Gedanken. Wir sagen kein Wort gegen den Fortschritt, gegen Weiterbildung und Modernisierung unsrer theologischen Anschauungen. Immerhin ist es heilsam, nötig, ja unerläßlich, daß das Element der Beharrung nicht fehle. Es gibt Dinge, die wir nicht aufgeben können, wie sehr wir auch begehren, mit Wissenschaft und Zeit Schritt zu halten. Hier kommt es uns zu statten, daß wir in unserm alten, deutschen Leserkreis das nötige Gegengewicht haben. Wir möchten sie um keinen Preis missen. Sie sollen treue Wächterdienste verrichten, so daß wir nicht Flittergold eintauschen für edles Metall, noch von unserm eigenen Streben erwarten, was nur Gottes Geist geben kann.

Um dessentwillen rufen wir allen Mitgliedern der „alten Garde" zu: Bleibt uns treu! und denen, die uns auf eine kleine Weile verlassen haben: Kommt wieder, wir bedürfen Eurer! Möge unser Ruf nicht ungehört verhallen.

The Christian World

The Lausanne Conference

The Living Church (Episcopal)

Milwaukee, Wis.

The Conference at Work

Combined Editorials by Frederic C. Morehouse, Editorial Delegate and Special Correspondence by C. H. Palmer

The designated speakers were so chosen as really to represent as many phases of Christianity as possible. If I add that not one of our American Church delegation was a designated speaker at any session during the Conference, I hasten to explain that it is probably because, having taken so prominent a part in the preliminary arrangements, our American Churchmen on the advance committees properly gave all the conspicuous places to others. And certainly Bishop Brent in his opening sermon and in his recognized preeminence everywhere, amply carried away honors for the American Church, and made his colleagues increasingly proud of him.

Still, this has had the result of presenting American Christianity entirely from the Protestant side, leaving Catholic factors in the Conference to be supplied wholly, on the Anglican side from England and her colonies, on the Orthodox side from Europe. This helps on the curious current opinion in England that the United States is a distinctly "Puritan" country.

Since the preamble alone was "adopted"—and that unanimously, including, I think, the entire Orthodox delegation—and the sectional reports were only "received" "for the consideration of our respective Churches," it follows that neither the conference nor the constituent "Churches" are committed to the letter of the reports themselves.

Many of us were amazed at the extent to which Protestants themselves desired to be ranged on the side of Catholic doctrine. Thus, in the debate on the report on the Sacraments, the text, tentatively accepted and before the Conference on final debate, contained the statement: "We believe that in the Holy Communion our Lord is present." A Congregational minister moved to prefix "especially" to "present." On a show of hands, all but seven in a house of more than a hundred voted for the amendment.

If the Orthodox felt that it would compromise them to recognize the actual fact that such-and-such opinions are held by sections of Christendom—it is not stated that they are held within the communion of the historic Church—they were bound to adopt the course they did. But I think the grave difficulty of a sparse or complete lack of understanding of the western languages used in the conference gave them a distorted idea of what the statements implied.

Yet when, last of all, the preamble was presented, and the conference was asked to "adopt"—not merely to "receive"—it, the whole delegation voted in the affirmative and several of them joined heartily in the applause at the unanimous vote. Yet the preamble itself contained the enacting clause by which the reports following were said to be "received."

It is the first time that East and non-Latin West have ever met together in this fraternal manner on such magnitude. It would be too much to expect entire understanding of each other at this stage. The Orthodox were justified in their attitude of extreme caution.

But their scholarly representatives, of whom there were about thirty, performed a very real service during every debate. They kept the conference from even the semblance of Pan-Protestantism. With Anglicans, with whom almost invariably they voted, they supplied much of the Catholic element that has been so largely manifest in the conference.

Not until within two hours of the closing day was there any semblance of real discord, when there was presented the sixth of the sectional reports, on the subject, The Unity of Christendom in Relation to Existing Churches. Written by the Archbishop of Upsala, it had already been presented in tentative form, had been radically criticized, and had been referred back to the drafting committee for further consideration. I think we all hoped and believed that it would come back to us in reasonably satisfactory form such that, with possibly a few amendments, it could be "received" as on a par with the other reports. Such had been the procedure with respect to each of them.

But when the revised text was in our hands, and the subject was immediately presented for consideration, we discovered that the general character of the language was very little changed. From beginning to end there was no intimation of the fact that "existing Churches" comprised anything whatever except the Protestant denominations. Every paragraph, every sentence, obviously contained that implication, though, of course, not directly expressed.

I think very many of us were in consternation. There was no time for mutual consultation. To "receive" the report as on a par with the others would be to interpret the whole conference and its pronouncements from the standpoint of Pan-Protestantism. It would have meant the failure of the hopes in which many of us went there.

It was moved that the report be "received for reference to the Continuation Committee" rather than on a par with the foregoing reports. One felt immediately the sense of hostility throughout the house. One recognized that Protestantism had set its heart on this acceptance of its sole position. A Chinese Congregationalist wildly asserted that he had only been able to vote for the other reports on the expectation that this one would be adopted and wished to change his vote to the negative on all that had gone before. Nothing could conceal the immediate feeling of rage toward the introducer of the resolution; and some of the Anglican delegates were foremost among these Protestant stalwarts.

It was an unhappy incident. But the report so obviously presented *only* the Protestant position, without even expressing the feeling after a larger Catholicity that so many of the best on the Protestant side have continuously shown, that I wonder that its author, or anybody else, could seriously have supposed that it could secure the necessary unanimous acceptance in a body in which Anglo-Catholics are by no means a negligible factor either in quantity or in ability. And it hurt me that Protestants *wanted* this one-sided action after we had been in such close fraternal relations for three whole weeks and had learned to have so high a regard for one another. Also I would have supposed that all the Anglican representatives would have rallied unanimously in vindication of what I supposed was the commonly accepted Anglican position as compared with that of Protestantism. They did not.

At any rate the Anglican representatives were divided. Some sympathized with the Pan-Protestant report, some did not. The Protestant element under the leadership of the Archbishop of Upsala created this condition themselves, without the slightest necessity. From every point of view their document was not fit to stand on a par with the other sectional reports. At best it was petty, inadequate, affording no assistance to the solution of its difficult problem. It was nineteenth century Protestantism injected into the twentieth century.

We have learned much from one another. Protestantism itself, in the persons of its strongest men, craves, earnestly craves, something spiritual from Catholicity. We are in a transition stage. The Holy Spirit is transforming our minds more rapidly than we have supposed. We are getting into the *will to unity*. And that is a long step.

This, practically, is what the composite mind has registered:

A Church that is greater than the churches, one, holy, catholic, and apostolic. To most of the delegates, that Church appears to be the sum total of the churches; and the churches remain autonomous factors, the whole (and possibly each) accepting the faith expressed in the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds, and each accepting the sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion in some form; all granting that in the latter there is a Presence of Christ, most of them holding that it is a "special" or a "real" Presence, both these terms having been accepted by an overwhelming majority of votes but failing for lack of absolute unanimity. All grant that there must be in all these churches a ministry that is accredited by all. Beyond that are, for the most part, reservations as to the separate positions of the different factors represented; and nowhere is this conception definitely stated. I am not using the actual terms of the reports. I am trying to express what seems to be the general mind rather than the written language. The final report, in which relations between the churches were stated in a pan-Protestant form, not receiving unanimous assent, was not sent forth with the others, but obviously expressed the very general sentiment, and not a few of the Anglican delegates seemed willing to accept it.

When a ministry accredited by all was affirmed as necessary to unity in this united Church, it was slearly understood that episcopal, presbyteral, and congregational factors must be correlated. No attempt was made to correlate them or to go further than the expression of the principle.

That means than an episcopate would everywhere be accepted; but what should be its function was not discussed. Neither was there any attempt to deal with the Papacy.

That bishops should ordain, or should act with others in ordaining, was, I think, commonly understood, though it was not directly expressed. But no one inquired what a bishop was to ordain. I do not think the term *priest* was once used in debate, neither can I discover that in the minds of the delegates there was the desire that bishops should ordain priests.

But—given valid bishops in this far-away united Church—what reason have we to believe that their ordinations would constitute priests in any Catholic sense? There would be no continuity of intention, as in the Anglican Churches, and, apparently, no current intention. No definite form of ordination was discussed. Bishops might conceivably ordain ministers; but that these would or could be priests, in the absence of any corporate or continuing intention of the Church, as well, generally, as of any individual intention, is not clear. The presumption would seem to be otherwise.

I think this bears out the contention that *The Living Church* has more than once made that, in formulating the terms of the Quadrilateral in 1886, it was a grave error to speak of the historic episcopate rather than of the historic ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons.

As far as I can see, we must now begin anew to propose to the Christian world the necessity of accepting the historic priesthood, which would probably have been accepted by this time along with the episcopate if we had propounded the whole threefold historic ministry to them at the time when we dislocated the latter by urging upon them the episcopate alone. For my part I cannot see that the acceptance of the historic episcopate divorced from the historic priesthood is of much value in paving the way for unity.

But Lausanne has not so much as heard whether there be an historic priesthood.

Two sacraments have been accepted, each with a very incomplete and deficient statement of its functions and purport. I want to say frankly that I was surprised at the degree of high sacramental appreciation that was expressed by many on the Protestant side. There are Presbyterians and Congregationalists who will go much beyond our Low Churchmen in their sacramental language.

But of the "five commonly called sacraments," apart from the reservation that there are those who accept seven sacraments, and apart from the statements in regard to the ministry, nothing was said. Can we, then, conceive of a huge section of a united Church that does not accept or administer Confirmation? There never has been an accepted

part of the Catholic Church, east or west, that did not accept and practice Confirmation, either at the hands of a bishop or with the anointing oil that had been consecrated by a bishop. If the historic episcopate should be introduced into this united Church, there is nothing to indicate that the children would be brought to the bishop to be confirmed by him, nor that Confirmation would be made the normal preparation for the Holy Communion. Can we contemplate a vast section of the Catholic Church in which there would be this variation from the historic practice?

And that I am frankly anxious over the fact that these really advanced representatives of the Protestant Churches of America and Europe do not appreciate any necessity for entering into vital relationship with the historic Catholic Church. Most of them hold that in the formation of their respective Churches there was no break from that Church. Lutherans, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists avowed this principle.

To hold that all baptized persons are *ipso facto* members of this Catholic Church is one thing; to hold that voluntary organizations that these have formed are corporate sections of that Church is quite another. Moreover some of these Churches (in the modern sense) have many members that are not baptized, and some of them actually refuse baptism to children. Where, then, is the principle that baptism is an act of admission to the Church, even if it followed that baptized members were free to form voluntary organizations of their own and to reckon these as Churches, free from any obligation to recognize the binding authority of the whole?

Two totally different conceptions were manifest in this conference. One group was striving to find a way to bring back into corporate relationship with the old-time Church the other group, which, in the conception of the former, was, *as organizations*, now unrelated to it. The second group was consciously seeking nothing of the kind, but rather a basis for bringing existing organizations into a measure of unity with each other, so that there might be common action and intercommunion between them all. One conceives of an urgent need for corporate unity, the other contemplates a federal unity. Can these two conceptions be correlated? Perhaps, ultimately; but not until they are frankly faced as difficulties, as they were not at Lausanne. The overwhelming majority not only held tenaciously to the latter view but resented the suggestion of the former.

Why should not Protestant Christianity be definitely encouraged to seek its own kind of unity, leaving Anglicans and Easterns entirely out? In my judgment we only embarrass them, especially when we do not definitely assert what are the differences that stand between us, but minimize them, as invariably we do.

It would be an immense gain in Christendom if the definitely Protestant world would form a single organization, based on their own tenets and formed according to their own conceptions. They do not want to be hampered by such ideas as creeds, historic ministries, bishops and priests. They have no interest in discussing the nature

either of episcopate or priesthood, of Confirmation, of sacramental grace. The issues in which they are interested are quite other than these.

At Lausanne they went (from their point of view) a long way to meet what they conceive to be our views, as steps toward unity. But they do not appreciate *why* we are so insistent on "our own way" nor what a long, long way from corporate reunion we are still left after all this splendid fraternization.

Our exclusion from such a "united Church" ought to be entirely compatible with the most friendly feeling toward it. And if our own Protestant section should make strong efforts to commit the Anglican Churches to this basis of pan-Protestant unity—I am not sure that it would if the issue were properly drawn—then we can only say that our Anglican Armageddon would have arrived and leave the outcome in the hands of the Holy Spirit.

We ought to face facts. If, by insisting on the only sort of unity in which we could participate, we are perpetuating the hundreds of sects into which Protestantism is divided, beyond the period in which Protestantism itself could unite them or many of them, are we helping or hampering the work of unity?

Eventually, we believe that Catholic unity will some, simply because we believe it to be the will of God that it should come. The *will to be merged* must probably be a preliminary condition. In the meantime a united Protestantism in place of a disunited, chaotic Protestantism would be a real step forward.

After all, truth will ultimately prevail, and it will be the Holy Spirit, rather than any human logic, that will eventually point the way to truth and unity, without sacrificing either one in the supposed interest of the other.—*Sept.* 3, 10, 17, '27.

German Lutheran's Views

C. H. Palmer, London

General Superintendent Zoellner was one of the German Lutheran delegates. It will be remembered that he made an exceedingly beautiful remark about the Creeds, "The Apostles' Creed is the folk-song of the people of God, the Nicene Creed is the expression of the conscious art of the theologians." In a Lutheran paper published at Berlin, *Das Evangelische Deutschland*, he has written some of his impressions about the conference. Critics doubted whether it would be possible to settle the question at such a large gathering. Many newspaper articles in Germany expressed the view that the simplest way to agree would be, let each have his own method of expression, forms, beliefs, and then each can love, respect, and unite with each other. If this view had won at Lausanne the whole Church would have been plunged into disaster. And on this point came in the legend from the English side: "We are first concerned not with reunion, but with truth."

A second danger was the adoption of formulae for unity, but which in reality had no meaning. They might have devised phrases for the

sake of compromise, and let each man interpret them as he would. That such unity would be false is quite obvious. It is naturally not easy for Americans coming from the New World without much history behind them to understand all the divisions which exist in the Old World. But the president of the congress, Bishop Brent, was careful to avoid this.

If it be asked what the congress did, it may be replied, at least it made a beginning. There was a burning desire to atone for the sins of the past. It is something accomplished when before the minds of Christians the *una sancta ecclesia* stands out as an ideal. The needs of the missionary world were especially felt. In a sermon which Pastor Keller preached at the German church in Lausanne during the congress, he asked, "What did all these persons assembled together really desire?" He gave as the answer: "They seek a Church." I think this answer was right. We value highly what we have got, but we also see what we lack.

It will be noticed that the learned and devout Lutheran takes the side of Bishop Temple and is against Dr. Parkes Cadman. He wants a Church, not a vague mixture of belief "to harmonize with a democratic age." This is a remarkable testimony coming from a Lutheran, and it shows there is in the Lutheran body today an aspiration to something more definite in the way of a Church.—*Oct.* 1, '27.

The Freedom of the Free Churches

What Do They Stand For? Are They Still Needed?

The Christian Union Quarterly, Baltimore, July, 1927

Extracts from Article by Dr. W. B. Selbie

Recent discussions on reunion, and certain events like the passing of the Enabling Act in the Anglican Church and the Disestablishment of the Church in Wales, have raised once more the question, What do the Free Churches stand for, and are they still needed. It may be frankly admitted that time and the grace of God have done much to diminish the need for their original witness. The claim of the State to exercise authority over the Church is by no means what it was in the reign of Elizabeth or even of Anne. Congregationalists have no longer any monoply in the belief in "gathered" churches and in the spiritual autonomy of God's people, nor are Methodists distinguished above all others for evangelistic zeal. The fact that those principles for which the first Nonconformists stood and suffered have now been almost universally recognized and accepted is certainly something to be thankful for. But it does not, for one moment, justify the assumption that these principles are now obsolete and may be disregarded. That such an assumption is often unconsciously entertained makes it all the more necessary that the Free Churches should know where they are and should look unto "the hole of the pit whence they were digged." They need today a new emphasis and a new perspective, but they need even more that living faith in the freedom of the gospel which characterized their fathers and the courage to reassert it fearlessly under the needs and conditions of the present time.

The so-called "Catholic" reaction, in the midst of which we find ourselves, is a direct challenge to all that we Free Churchmen stand for and count precious. We cannot meet it by mere negations, but only by a positive reassertion, both in theory and practice, of those spiritual values which we have inherited and which alone constitute our *raison d'etre.*

The first thing we have to do is to be sure that we really believe in the liberty wherein we stand and are prepared to take the consequences of it. Our churches, as a rule, show themselves tolerably independent of outside authority. They recognize the force of tradition, public opinion, and the like, but in no case would they be willing blindly to obey them. They are always jealous for the crown rights of Jesus Christ. They recognize Him as the sole Head of the Church, and in the gift of the Holy Spirit they find the power that animates, sustains, and guides them. What they need, however, is to live up to the full measure of their belief. They are far too prone to follow traditional lines both in thought and action merely because they are traditional. Many of the older folk among them seem content to take "safety first" for their motto, and fear to launch out into new ways or risk any adventurous action. In spite of their boasted freedom they are often as hidebound and conservative as those churches which have none of their advantages. The stiffness and conventionality of the forms of worship in many Free Churches are a real hindrance to progress, and suggest to the outsider an air of unreality which is not attractive. Our freedom in this respect is at least as much of a responsibility as a privilege. We depend not on stately ritual or time-honored forms, but on the living presence and inspiration of the Spirit of God. Where this is not consciously realized both by minister and people, prayer and praise become jejune and meaningless, and worship loses all its power and savour. On the other hand, nothing could be more helpful and beautiful than the spontaneous outpouring of man's gratitude and need in the presence of God and the living communion with Him which such worship involves. The Free Churches have an unexampled opportunity of making the public worship of the sanctuary a thing so real and vital that men and women will not need to be drawn to it more or less reluctantly, but will gladly welcome it as an indispensable means of grace and life. To this end they will need to cultivate reality and adaptability above all other things.

The same is true with regard to the general work of the churches. It is an astonishing fact that there are ministers and church members who are opposed to modern methods of Sunday-school teaching and administration, and that simply on the ground that they are a departure from use and precedent. Unless they are prepared to make some radical new departures and to use to the full their liberty in this direction, they may as well recognize that "their doom is writ."

And what are we to say of our theological freedom? Here again, our churches are in grave danger of being entangled in a yoke of bondage. While they pay lip service to liberty, they are apt to be

very suspicious of freedom of thought in the pulpit. It is hardly yet realized that the restatement of Christian doctrine in modern terms is a matter of life and death for our churches. Many young ministers who are thoroughly evangelical in spirit find their work hampered and their motives suspected by those who cannot tolerate any departure from time-honored forms and phrases. It is to be feared that some of our congregations do not want to be taught, and are hardly aware that they have anything to learn. They shrink from untried ways and ideas as from something dangerous. They like their ministers to play for safety by the soothing repetition of what they have heard a thousand times before. The result is that young people with alert and inquiring minds can hardly escape the feeling that the pulpit does not always tell them all the truth, and so are still further estranged, not merely from the Church, but from all that the Church stands for. One can understand a situation like this in churches which are creed-bound and dogma-ridden. But it ought not to be possible with us. We believe in the guidance of the Spirit of God who will lead us into all the truth. We also believe that God has yet more light and truth to break forth from his Word, and we ought to hold ourselves free to receive the new light and pass it on to others.

For it must always be remembered that it is essential to our Free Church position to find our only authority in God Himself through his Holy Spirit. Scriptures, creeds, councils, traditions, and organizations are all fallible and temporary. They have their uses and are invaluable in their place. But they cannot bind either the hearts or consciences of men. That we are made for God, and restless until we find Him, is evidenced by the fact that in the long last we will obey what we believe to be the will of God at all costs and before all others. Free Churchmen are not masterless men, nor do they indulge in license under the cloak of liberty. But they bring all authorities to the test of the will and truth of God as revealed in Jesus Christ, and as confirmed in Christian experience. They put religion before churches and faith before doctrines, and they hold themselves free to follow new ways both of thought and action at the bidding of the living word of God. This freedom they regard as a priceless heritage from the past, and their whole future depends on the extent to which they honor and maintain it.

Are the Creeds "Outworn Categories"?

The Lutheran, Philadelphia, August 25th, 1927

Editorial

This is a question that needs a decisive answer. Nearly every book we read that deals with questions of faith (excepting those that be issued from the Lutheran, Presbyterian and parts of the Reformed press) speaks in condemnation of the creeds, from the Apostles' Creed all the way down to the Westminster Catechism. It would be easy to fill a book with quotations from so-called "Modernists," and even "Fundamentalists," that make creeds and doctrine synonymous with

a non-progressive and defunct Christianity. They are made responsible for the existing sectarianism and are denounced in many quarters as obstacles in the way of Christian unity. That surely is not the case in the Roman Catholic Church. The real cause for a disunited Protestantism must be sought for elsewhere. It is the roving, rambling, latitudinarian, anti-doctrinal spirit that creates ten or more divisions where the creedal spirit creates one.

Why Call Creeds "Outworn Categories"?

Let us look at the term from the point of view of the Modernist, who is responsible for it. He does not deny that the great creeds of Christendom embody in their formulas the essential truths of Christianity. He simply denies that they can speak with authority in the present age because they were born at crisis when Christian life and thought wore a complexion different from that of the present day. Truth in the fourth or the sixteenth century took on forms and concepts that are strange and foreign to us now. The Church that fails to take account of this may have a substantially correct theology, but not in a form suited to the age. The creedal categories are not necessarily untrue, but they are "outworn."

To appreciate the viewpoint of these Modernists, who are not ready to cast overboard the essential truths of the creeds, we reread the Formula of Concord, which, after a series of controversies that disturbed the peace of the Lutheran Church for a generation, became the restorer of harmony. It was not difficult to understand how, apart from a knowledge of their historic background, a stranger would come to the conclusion that its categories are surely outworn. Zeal for a clear and definite expression of faith was then the great concern of earnest students of the Scriptures. They were men of faith, and the Scriptures were to them the sole and final authority, as they are not now. But great changes have taken place in Protestantism since the year 1580, when doctrinal unity in the Lutheran Church was restored. The "categories" of the Formula of Concord would hardl yappeal to Modernists, who are more profoundly interested in adjusting Christian faith to modern thought and life than in making it square with the Scriptures.

Old Heresies in New Form

And yet every one of the disputed questions which the Formula of Concord settled are in evidence today, as they were then. The seven controversies after Luther's death revolved around errors that are now even more dangerous and far more insidious now than they were then. Poor, compromising Melanchthon and his followers came near allowing the yoke of Roman Catholic jurisdiction to be placed upon the neck of the Lutheran Church. Hence the "Leipsiz Interim" controversy. It would be easy to name quite a few tendencies in Protestantism that bear the earmarks of Roman Catholicism.

Then came what was known as the *Majoristic* controversy, which raged around the question of the relation of good works to man's

salvation. Major maintained that they were necessary to salvation, and Amsdorf in his zeal to defend the scriptural doctrine of salvation by faith alone went so far as to say that good works might tempt men to ground their salvation upon them rather than upon free grace and thus prove detrimental to salvation. The Formula came to the rescue and made plain that good works are the fruit of saving faith and its evidence, and hence are not a ground of justification before God. Read much of the Christian literature of today and see how it is shot through with the Roman Catholic teaching and practice of good works.

Then came the *Antinomian* controversy, which involved the relation of the law and the Gospel. If there is a finer setting forth of the correct scriptural relation between the two and the function of each than is found in the formula, it would be interesting to know where it is. There is much Christianity today that smacks more of law than of gospel.

Then came the *Osiandrian* controversy, which swung around the great central doctrine of jurisdiction. Osiander and his party claimed that Christ's righteousness through justification was infused and not imputed, as the formula makes clear. It would be interesting to make a study of the confused ideas that many Christians have concerning the relation of justification to sanctification.

Another important issue was raised by what is known as the *Synergistic* controversy, which swung around the question as to what part the sinner had to perform in effecting his own salvation or conversion. The formula made clear that the sinner's transformation is through the power of the Gospel alone. What we sing in the hymn, "Rock of Ages," is the faith which the formula sets forth. Who does not know the many varieties of Synergism in modern Christian thought? Our religious literature is full of the idea that man can take hold of his boot straps and lift himself up into favor with God without much, if any, help from above.

The *Flacian* controversy had to do with original sin, Flacius contending that sin inhered in human nature as part of its very substance. The formula makes clear that originial sin is not a physical defect but simply moral depravity. Today the very thought of original sin is repellant to many people who insist that all that is needed is to make them conscious of it. Sin is no longer guilt demanding retribution.

What is known as the *Crypto-Calvinistic* controversy had to do with the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. In endeavoring to defend the real presence in the sacrament, much logic was used that sounds strange to modern ears. Even Lutherans would hardly care to reason about that mystery as the theologians did in that day. Their categories would seem much outworn. But necessity to define was upon them, and the formula rescued the situation by statements that will always be repellant to those who explain away the words of both Christ and the apostle Paul and make the sacrament at best a mere memorial.

All the errors above mentioned appear in new and varied forms and must be countered in a way and manner that will fit the peculiar trends of thought and life which make the present age so radically different from, and yet so essentially the same as, the sixteenth century. The Lutheran Church will do well to take into account this changed and perplexing situation and to proclaim its faith in a manner and language which will appeal to the modern mind.

The Fewness of Our Converts

THOMAS F. COAKLEY, D.D.

The "Official Catholic Directory" for 1927 presents some interesting figures relative to the propagation of the Faith in this country. For the first time we find in the consolidated summary of statistics a separate column for converts. Not all the dioceses make reports of converts, but from those for which figures are available, I have picked out the four archdioceses and five dioceses in the Eastern half of the United States whose figures are the highest. The data in detail follows:

	No. of Priests	No. of Converts	Av. per Priest
Baltimore	571	1860	3.2
Boston	987	1130	1.1
Philadelphia	955	1529	1.6
Cincinnati	454	830	1.8
Brooklyn	656	1611	2.4
Detroit	557	2120	4.
Cleveland	452	873	1.9
Pittsburgh	665	835	1.2
Newark	710	920	1.3
Total	6007	11708	1.9
Grand Total for U. S.	24,990	35751	1.4

These figures show that the average number of converts made by each priest in the United States is 1.4 per year.

With 25,000 priests in the United States and with 90,000,000 non-Catholics to bring into the fold, some mathematician with a fondness for differential calculus might tell us how long it is going to take to preach the Gospel to the whole of America. Of a truth the Faith is not making tremendous headway among us if the figures quoted in the "Catholic Directory" are to be relied upon.

As a matter of fact, it is well known that priests are not responsible for all converts. Many of them are the result of mixed marriages; not a few are the result of the instruction in Christian Doctrine which as a rule precedes mixed marriages in many dioceses. A respectable percentage of converts is the happy consequence of illness in Catholic hospitals; while perhaps the minority are due to private reading and study or the influence of Catholic friends and associates.

Book Review

(When ordering books, please mention this Magzaine.)
NOTE—Reviews, when not signed, are by the Editor.

The Book Nobody Knows, *by Bruce Barton.* The Bobbs Merrill Co., Indianapolis, 1926. 306 pages, $2.50.

Last year we discussed Barton's first book—which proved a "best seller" of the season—"The Man Nobody Knows." In it he sought to explain the success of Jesus' life, not on supernatural, but on natural grounds. Jesus' life is the *greatest achievement story* that manykind knows. The secret lay in his magnetic personality. He appealed to men because of his strong manliness, his buoyant optimism, his sociable nature. He had great executive talent, knew how to pick and develop men. As the one who fully realized the principle of service in his life, he is the founder of modern business. And he not only believed in these principles himself, he got others to believe in them for he was the greatest advertizer that ever lived. Barton wrote his life of Jesus for business men, and the business men liked it and bought it. To us it seemed unsatisfactory for Jesus was more than a genius, he was divine; and if Paul was right in seeing in the cross the quintessence of the Christian faith, Barton is wrong.

Owing to our disagreement with him on the first book, we approached this second with some prejudice; but we are happy to say, after going through it, that we rather like it. It is in Barton's unconventional style, sparkling with apt remark and amusing anecdote. It is written for the ordinary reader; still, even the minister may learn much from it.

He says, the bible gives a bird's-eye view of the development of civilization, a sort of "Outline of History"; and then he takes up the bible story from Genesis to David, illuminating his review with interesting comment. Thereupon he goes on to enlarge on the literary excellence of the bible. Here you find "the greatest of all poems, one of the greatest dramas, one of the finest love-stories and a collection of proverbs which in varying phraseology have entered into the common-sense philosophy of nearly every modern nation."

He gives selections from the psalms and the wisdom literature (ascribed to Solomon), and readings from the prophets of Israel down to the exile, bringing the personalities of these preachers of righteousness and hope into strong relief. The Old Testament, he says is the record of God's progressive revelations of himself to men. A God who had to be persuaded by argument and sacrifice—this was the God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob. But when we come to Amos we hear: "God cares nothing about sacrifice; He is a God of justice." Yes,

adds Hosea, and a God of kindness. And finally, in Jonah the most compassionate note is struck: Jehovah is the God of Nineveh as well as of Jerusalem, his love reaches to the end of the earth. The four gospels give us the story of "the great life." Theologians have engaged in a good deal of doctrinal controversy about the person of Jesus, about the Virgin Birth, his miracles, the atonement, and so forth. Jesus seems to have thought little of these questions. At any rate, he was much more tolerant towards heretical opinions than any of his followers. "His was the broadest sort of invitation to fellowship, having no petty barriers of creed or formulae or ceremony. "He went about doing good." "Never man so spake." These—his good works and his good words—are the things for which he wished to be remembered; they constitute the story of his life." Barton has told us in his first book why he considers Jesus' life the "greatest achievement story" ever written. In this second book there is no reiteration of the same arguments. He simply tells the story of those three years in brief outline. It is the story that changed the whole world, he says; but that it changed the world by the reconciliation and redemption wrought in and by Christ Jesus, Barton does not say.

Then follow "the Acts and the Epistles." "The shadow of the cross extended so rapidly that in less than a single century it falls across the emperor's throne." Barton traces the dramatic steps by which this incredible success was won. He does it in vivid strokes, interspersing much interesting detail from contemporary sources (e. g. Pliny's famous letter to emperor Trajan, written about 40 years after Paul's death). The apostle Paul is the most successful promotional agent of the gospel, the greatest church builder, and perhaps the finest Christian character of the ages. He is also the representative Liberal of early Christianity. He won against the Fundamentalists of his time in the first Church Convention, held at Jerusalem (Acts 15). His letter to the Galatians is the "Magna Charta of Christian liberty. It is the rebuke of bigotry and the battle cry of freedom." Paul stood his ground against hard-shell theology and strict constructionists from Judaea.

Barton seems to have prized the letter to the Galatians almost as highly as did Martin Luther. But to Barton, Paul is fighting for intellectual freedom, to Luther he is fighting for free grace and redemption by faith only.

The letters of the New Testament are discussed in Barton's best style. In Corinth the New Testament began to be written. From here Paul sends out the two letters to the Thessalonians. To get a taste of how Barton puts us in touch with the situation of writer and recipients, one must read his comment on first and second Thessalonians. He has a striking gift for touching up the dimmed colors of the background, thus shedding fresh light on the picture.

At times the play of his imagination produces results more amusing than convincing. For instance, he says, in prison at Rome, Paul was having rather a good time. He lived in his own hired house, entertaining lavishly. The five years there must have cost him thirty

thousand dollars (according to an eminent scholar), six thousand dollars a year for rent in Rome, where rents were high, and for food for his large household, and for transportation for himself and his companions. We don't know where the money came from, but never has the world spent 30,000 dollars to better purpose.

In chapters 5 and 6 the author presents "ten great men" and "ten famous women" of the bible. Then he has a very interesting chapter on, how did we get the Bible? A surgeon of national reputation asked him, in his book, to give an answer to two questions:

1. How were the books of the Bible gathered into a collection? Who selected them and how do we know that the right ones were selected?

2. By what means were these chosen books preserved and handed down?

The answer to the first question is: the books of the Old Testament which were most used and gave most inspiration survived. It is a case of survival of the fittest. The books of the New Testament were also selected by the process of use. The first books were apostolic letters, those of Paul and the larger letters of Peter, John and James. When the gospel appeared they were at once used in like fashion, because they were so important and so interesting. There was immediate agreement on the chief books, the 4 gospels and the larger epistles. Gradually there came to be agreement on all, not by authority but by the test of general usage; and the translations, and later the printing of the bible, finally fixed the list.

The answer to the second question is, they were preserved before the art of printing, in manuscripts, in whose composition extreme care was used. The earliest manuscript copies date from the 4th century. Barton here tells the story of Tischendorf's discovery of the "Sinaitic" in most interesting fashion. In 1844, at St. Catherine's monastery on the Sinaitic peninsula, Tischendorf rescued 47 leaves of one of the oldest manuscripts of the Septuagint from being used to kindle a fire in his room. In 1859 he returned to the monastery, now with the authority of the Czar of Russia, and, on his last evening there, the steward showed him a parcel wrapped in red cloth. Imagine his almost delirious joy when he saw, on untying it, not only the Septuagint, but the New Testament complete.

The other two old manuscripts of the bible are the Vatican at Rome and the Alexandrine in the British Museum.

Barton tells us, in the rest of the chapter, of the higher and lower critics and their work, and of the translations, especially of the bible into English, from Wiclif down to the American Standard Version of 1901, and the latest versions by Moffatt, Goodspeed, and the one by Ballantine (the Riverside Bible); giving the King James Version the palm for beauty but recognizing the value of the others for the purpose of comparison and for better understanding of the original. On the whole a chapter replete with useful information for every minister.

In the closing chapter on the "Influence of the Bible," its circu-

lation in the past and now, the testimonials of writers of every shade of belief and unbelief, and the attested fruits of its use in the most desperate cases makes an impressive argument.

Barton is not interested in theology, in metaphysics or in controversy. Beliefs and creeds are mere mental ballast to him. But these characteristics—or shall we call them limitations?—he shares with the age. He believes, however, that the bible as a literature, as a book of great biographies, above all of the life of Jesus, that the bible as the fountain head of moral and spiritual values, has enough human interest to insure it a high place in modern life, if presented with a modern appeal.

The title of his book was suggested to him by a reader of his first one. Barton, of course, never intended to intimate that he was the only one who knew the bible as it ought to be known. His idea was that most people thought the bible was a rather tiresome book, while in reality it is exceedingly interesting; that it was a book for the preacher and theologian, while it is a book for all the world; that it was a book of doctrines, while it is a book of the men of God; that it had only a remote connection with the problems of the daily life, while really it helps us to solve these very problems.

Along these lines Barton has labored with considerable zest and success. He may not have said all that would and should be said about it. However, if he has induced his readers only to step into the outer courts of the sanctuary, he will have rendered them a great service. And if in time they find their way into the inner shrine no one doubtless would be more rejoiced than the author.

The Appeal to Reality, by R. Edis. Fairbairn. The Abingdon Press, 1927. 192 p., $1.00.

The modern mind is bent on the quest for reality in all fields of human endeavor. Religion could not be expected to escape this general tendency, and religion can stand, and even welcomes, this test. In the domain of science the two Bacons were the fathers of the new method of observation and experimentation which have resulted in the wonderful discoveries and results in the exploration of nature. The application of the critical method to religion is of more recent date. To a great many faith and science have to do with different worlds, they are even said to be opposed to each other.

The writer rather thinks that they cannot be so divorced. If science teaches us to be loyal to the facts of the world around us so far as these facts are ascertainable by us, so the modern approach to religion—the new Realism, he calls it—is an attitude of utter loyalty to the facts given in the religious life. The "two piers on which the arch of the Christian faith rests" are the historic manifestations of God in Christ and individual spiritual experience. It is our task to present the facts of Christ's life and personality so intelligently that people are convinced by it and accept them. It may be impossible to furnish abso-

lutely compelling proof but, according to the writer, it ought to be possible to show that the weight of greater probability is in favor of the truth of the Christian claims.

Throughout the book the author pleads for an open mind for the attitude of modern scholarship. He accepts the gradualness of the religious insight in the biblical writers (the bible is a "religious literature rather than an authoritative divine dictation"). The person of Christ is the decisive factor; on metaphysical questions one may be satisfied to be a "cheerful agnostic." He deprecates the old forms of revivalism. Emotion is a by-product, intelligent conviction is the better thing. The "simple gospel," so often mistakenly stressed, the "finished work" of Christ, are in most cases an easy substitute of people lazy in thought and conduct for the full gospel of real consecration.

Of special interest were to us his reflections on the newer psychology. We agree with him that the live problem of today is that of the bearing of this psychology on religion. Is the subconscious a correcter term for what we have so far called the "soul"? Are Christian Science and New Thought and other schools of suggestion that achieve such remarkable results in soul culture and joy of life, legitimate competitors of Christianity? Can we say—with W. James—that God uses a variety of ways to secure a variety of religious experiences? Are the New Thought people really finding God, only under different names? The author does not answer these questions. He only makes up his mind to this, that "no life finds enrichment and enlargement by contact with inner realities without finding God." But we trust that he is not willing to give up his faith in the absoluteness of the Christian religion.

One regrettable slip of the writer's we cannot but mention. In the chapter, "Creating a Social Instinct," he uses the pre-war Germany as an example of the creation of a false instinct. We hear the old stories again of Nietzsche, the father of German imperialism, of Germany's "diabolical" scheme of world-exploitation; of the German manufacture of a diabolical "Kultur," etc. And this in 1927 We had supposed that all these atrocity stories of Allied Propaganda had been definitely buried, and that after Professor Barnes, and others, the light had broken through somewhat. But we see the old mythologies (Barnes) die hard, and some have a definitely closed mind. Still a man who is after reality and loyalty to facts ought to be able to see in 1927 what he could not see in 1917.

With this exception, we have derived a good deal of inspiration from the book. We do not always agree, but reaching out for reality is a laudable and necessary endeavor.

Purpose in Teaching Religion, by *George W. Fiske* (Professor of Religious Education Graduate School of Theology Oberlin College). The Abingdon Press, 1927. 244 pages, $1.75.

The teachers in our Sunday schools are in many cases very earnest, but what they lack is an intelligent understanding of the purpose of religious education and an acquaintance with the modern methods of teaching. This book is written to give information along both these lines.

The author has great faith in the power of teaching. Some people have claimed that religion must be caught, not taught. Our writer disagrees altogether with this assertion. He admits indeed that we cannot presume to control the presence or the cooperation of the Holy Spirit, and that we cannot guarantee the action of supernatural grace. We should not try to substitute educational mechanics for divine grace or spiritual power. Still we can teach "the infinite importance of this supernatural source of power, and the ways in which the human heart can be opened to God's spirit and can learn to cooperate with him in a vital partnership of life." The purpose of religious teaching is not, to instruct in doctrines (or the catechism), or knowledge of the Bible. Our modern curriculum is pupil-centered. Its aim is to teach the child or youth the Jesus-way of living; to start with the individual, inspiring him with the motives and ideals of Jesus; then to make him understand, and adopt, the aims represented in Jesus' conception of the Kingdom of God. The golden rule is to be applied to the business world, to politics, to international relations. A merely moral education is not enough. It must be undergirded by religious sanctions. Only the love of God will furnish sufficient spiritual and emotional power to solve the personal and collective problems of the age.

In the second part the author analyses the current methods in the light of the educational principles developed in the earlier chapters. He pleads for a graded curriculum (favoring the department unit); for a generous use of methods appealing to the imagination (films, dramatics, stories), and especially, for the modern "project teaching" of religion. This project method is useful because in it the pupil becomes active, not a passive listener or mere answerer only; the teaching subjects are acted out and therefore make a deeper impression on the scholar. This reviewer has no experience along this line, and the book does not show how particular projects might be carried out, so we must withhold our judgment on this interesting phase.

We have read the book with great interest. It imparts a great deal of information, is thoroughly up-to-date. It is evidently written by a man not only well acquainted with the theory but also the practice of modern religious education. If it was read by many teachers it would convince them of the necessity of a radical change in their teaching methods. It might cause many to drop out of the teacher ranks, and that would be a good riddance.

The Nest of Spears, by *F. W. Boreham.* The Abingdon Press, 1927. 284 pages, $1.75.

Boreham is a prolific writer. Every year another book of his is on the market. We had long decided to pass him up, but as we take up his latest volume, the twentieth by the way, we feel ourselves again getting under his spell. He likes to find his subjects among the common place things and experiences of life. Who, for instance, would think that a magpie could give inspiration to any one? And yet, here he has a chapter on "A. D.", the Artful Dodger, a magpie, which has a strange mania for collecting things simply to have them around, and goes on to speak of the human magpie, the boys and girls who gather things that are of no earthly use to them; the ladies, unmarried, that run from one fad to another, and the men who load their nests with scrip and deeds and stocks and shares that can never help them in the hour of real need; down to the royal magpie, emperor Caligula, who went North to conquer the Britons and, instead, collected pretty pebbles, starfish and seaweed and sailed for home.

Or take the next chapter, "the angel with the whip." There is a boy who likes the swish and crack of the whip he had lately received as a present, why, so muses our author, does the boy derive such strange, satisfaction from his whip? He discovers that the whip is the sign of authority. When man first tore off a soft, yielding branch from the willow tree and plucked off the leaves, lo and behold, he had a whip in his hand He was a king, he ruled. And then the whip became the instrument of authority. Even the angels use the whip to drive us to work and effort, and without its lashes frequently applied who would be a saint, or how could the work of the world be done?

So the author goes on through 40 chapters, apparently with perfect ease, still showing clearly the skill of the finished artist. His illustrations are often most helpful and he has a strange gift for opening the eyes to the deeper meanings of life's ordinary experiences. In a happy way he points out the spiritual law in the physical world.

The Truth and the Life and other Sermons, by Joseph Fort Newton, D.D., L.L.D. Geo. H. Doran Co. 1926. 340 pages.

Mr. Newton, whom some of us know from his occasional contributions to the "Christian Century," is listed among the "25 leading ministers" of the country (see March number of "Magazine," 1925, P.P. 138-139). He has occupied some of the most prominent pulpits in America, and in England. In this volume he gives us a collection of 24 sermons that are characteristic of his manner and spirit. They are the fruits of the years following the World War. "Such unity as they have is to be found in the faith which they seek to interpret and expound; a faith-finding its center and circumference in Christ, in whom the character of God, the meaning of life, and the prophecy of the soul become incandescent in a vision so ineffably lovely that the words of the

preacher are but stammering beggars about a throne. If no echo of the angry debates which have agitated the churches is heard in these sermons, it is because the preacher has no interest in such issues, deeming them in no wise relevant to the actual issues of our age."

Here we have his program and his theological position. We do not want dogma, he says, we want the living God. What we need is not more books of dogma but more Christ-like lives. The real Higher Criticism is not a question as to the Gospel of Luke or John, but the Gospel according to you and me. Our little lives are a part of the vast biography of Jesus. "Ye are letters of Christ, known and read of all men" (2 Cor. 3: 2-3). Of all truths none is more practical, none less metaphysical, than the truth of the incarnation—that is, the incarnation of Christ in us. Sir Philip Sidney describes what that truth means when it becomes real in actual life.

> A sweet, attractive kind of grace;
> The full assurance given by looks;
> Perpetual comfort in a face;
> The lineaments of Gospel books.

"Never yet has the church learned that the creed of Jesus is not assent to a form of words, but consent to a way of life." And again, in the sermon on the "Ministry of Music": "The church was built to music. If we could not answer atheism with an argument, we could smother it with an anthem. When we argue we are far apart; when we sing we are heart to heart."

We see N. is not interested in dogmatics at all; not in the confession of the mouth or the statements of a creed, but in the fruits of a Christ-like spirit. The church, in his opinion, is "a society for promoting goodness." Its first business, and the last, is to make good men and women, little brothers and sisters of the Lord Jesus who "went about doing good." The best laid plans of social betterment go awry for lack of men and women good enough to make them come true. Nevertheless, the discovery of the social gospel is the supreme achievement of the time. The most ambitious part of the social program is the movement for the outlawry of war. According to our faith in the ultimate reality of God or no God, so it will be unto us, whether war is to be eternal or the rule of force shall give way to the reign of reason.

Newton's insistence on the supreme importance of the Christian character, on the *effects* of faith, is surely justified. Only that faith is of value that issues in better lives. Still, life is always imperfect and certitude of salvation cannot rest on the degree of righteousness we have attained. The supreme discovery of the Reformation was that man is justified by faith in Christ, not by his own works. The overemphasis of this truth led, in America, to the Unitarian counter-statement that "salvation is by character, not by faith" (Channing). The Unitarian, although possessed of great leaders, have not been able to win much of a following by their stress on ethics and their appeal to

reason. The foolishness of the Pauline gospel and the "sola fide" of the Reformers continued to find favor with the masses more than the moralistic preaching of the Unitarians.

Not once have we found in Newton's sermons a reference to this fact, that man enters a state of grace by the simple trust in Christ, and that all through his Christian development Christ and his redemption continues to be the foundation of his fellowship with God.

As to the matter of creeds and doctrinal statements, the church has always felt the need of defining what she considers the "articuli stantis and cadentis ecclesiae." Her original intention was, thus to mark off truth from error. Even as late as 1926, when the Methodists of Canada united with the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists (the latter a comparatively liberal body), they adopted a very elaborate —and very orthodox—creed (see "Magazine," July, 1926, p. 273 ff). To us their creedal articles seemed spun out to unnecessary lengths; but doubtless the Presbyterians would not be satisfied with less.

Newton thinks the day is coming when the church will invite all good men to work and worship together in the name of the Eternal Goodness. We are rather inclined to believe that the church will stand by the Apostles' Creed, and that she will insist that goodness comes by the redemptive life and power of Christ and that no other way will quite suffice. In the light of the past we believe the time will never come when the church will shed her theology. From her beginning she has always maintained her trinitarian faith. She has always seen in Christ more than the "supreme revealer of God and the realization of perfect humanity." She has seen in him the one who brings about the objective reconciliation of mankind with God. The supernatural side of his person and works she has through her whole history contended for against all comers. In our opinion she will continue to stand for these things in her creed.

The titles of the sermons are such as these: the Golden Rule; the Meaning of Prayer; the Church for Today; the Final Church; the Soul and the Crowd; the Spirit of Truth; Amen. Newton is a poet; he gets his inspiration from the poets. He never even mentions a theologian. He seems to compose with astonishing ease, his sentences rolling out from him smooth and graceful. He is somewhat of a mystic; Troeltsch would class him with the "spiritualists." The prayers which precede each sermon also have a saintly charm, they are quite unlike the prayers we generally hear.

It is a rare treat to read such sermons, perhaps on a Sunday afternoon. They do not indoctrinate but they cultivate a sweet Christian spirit, and they reveal the author's gifted, noble soul.

The Outlawry of War. A Constructive Policy for World Peace, by *Charles Clayton Morrison*, D.D., Litt. D. Editor "The Christian Century." With a Foreword by John Dewey, Professor of Philosophy, Columbia University. Willett, Clark and Colby—Chicago, 1927. 300 p. $3.00.

Mr. Morrison has traveled far since 1917. When the War broke out he spent some time as an honored guest of the Britsh government behind the lines in France. No doubt at that time he felt that the cause of the Allies was the cause of civilization and the hope of the world; that the war was a holy crusade to save democracy from being strangled by that "Potsdam gang"; and that after this war the millennium was just in the offing. When peace was declared and the Versailles Treaty was made public he began to feel a sinking of the heart. He had not, like Atlene Pomerene, wished for a "rattlesnake peace" for the Germans, and the peace of Versailles was just that. His idealism had been genuine and now he saw that the idealism of the Allies had only been camouflage and that they had been out for plunder all the time.

It took him several years to convince himself that the Germans were not the sole originators of the war. Still he deserves everlasting credit for publishing, in his own paper, those famous articles of Professor Barnes, where that doughty champion sought to show that Russia and France were the real war criminals, not Germany.

His experiences with the World War have disillusionized Mr. Morrison very thoroughly. He has come to see that not only that war was a bane and not a blessing, but that war itself is an unmitigated evil. He is, however, by no means satisfied with that negative result or with an attitude of resignation. On the contrary, he has joined himself to that group of "irreconcilables" who have sworn eternal enmity to war itself and will never rest until war as an institution is abolished.

Since the termination of the World War the movement for peace has found expression in a number of schemes. The League of Nations, the Geneva protocol, the Locarno pact have all tried to make their contribution to the cause of peace: they all tried to limit or prevent war. However, their fatal mistake was that they aimed to prevent war *by war* or by the threat of war; they all left war itself, war as a legitimate institution, undisturbed. They condemned *aggressive* war and banded themselves together against a possible aggressor nation. The trouble about the outlawing of aggressive war is that it won't work. The World War has shown that every nation going to war claims to do it in defense of its rights, and who is to determine who is the aggressor?

Therefore the only way out of the dilemma is to decide to have done with these gradual "steps" towards war's elimination, and outlaw war itself. The first proposition of this kind was made by Mr. Levinson, and the movement has finally resulted in Senator Borah's resolution before the United States Senate "to outlaw war by interna-

tional treaty, to create a satisfactory code of international law whose fundamental stipulation is just this outlawry of war, and thus organize the world for peace."

This is the plan that Mr. Morrison upholds in this book with all the fervor of a devout believer and all the skill of a keen logician. He knows the stupendous difficulties in the way; knows that nothing short of a world revolution can bring it to pass. He says: "The outlawry of war involves a complete and radical reorientation of the nations in their international relationships. War cannot effectually be displaced by anything but law—not by arbitration, not by cutting down armaments, nor by military alliances with nicely balanced power, nor by a political league of national units deciding disputes through diplomats, nor by regional pacts, nor by overwhelming force concentrated at a single world center—but by law universally recognized and embodied in a court vested with authority to apply it to international disputes. Has not the hour struck for the nations to pluck this infamous institution out of the legal system of civilization—to set up in the place long held by this Supreme Court of War a *Supreme Court of Justice and Peace?*" The decision of the Court would be enforced by the weight of the public opinion of all enlightened nations. The employment of force is neither contemplated nor required.

In following the author in his well reasoned and at times passionately expressed presentation, it is almost equally hard to be a doubting Thomas as a believing Peter. If we hold the view that the Kingdom of God is ultimately to prevail in this world, war no doubt must go; still it seems an ideal so remote at the present time that one feels like saying with Faust: "I hear the message but I lack the faith." True the American churches have given the program strong support, but these same churches a few years ago were as war-mad as their European allies. Have they experienced a real change of heart, have they shown fruit meet for repentance? On Nov. 11 we had in this city an Armistice celebration of the church people. The speaker, a Jewish rabbi, told them our war had been a needless war: the church people fairly gasped! Among all the Christian ministers on the platform there was not one who would have endorsed that statement. The account of the rabbi's most remarkable address was hidden away in the local papers: like clergy, like people. Some have doubtless seen the light but they are doing nothing to remedy the wrongs done while we helped the Allies win their war. As long as we fail to make the slightest effort to undo the harm caused by us, in a very concrete instance, our ideals may indeed soar sky-high but they have no feet to walk on this earth.

Mr. Morrison has sung a great song, and there is no question it is a song of Zion, in fact it is an elaboration on the angel's song in Bethlehem's fields. He means what he sings; most others seldom mean what they sing, they just sing. There will probably a good many years go by before all people sing as Mr. Morrison does, and still more till they all mean what they are singing.

Erinnerungen einer deutschen Pfarrfrau aus 52jähriger Amtszeit in Süd- und Nord-Amerika von **Emilie Schaefer.** Eden Publishing House, St. Louis-Chicago. 1927. 159 Seiten.

Unser Verlag hat uns ein Buch auf den Weihnachtstisch gelegt, das ohne Zweifel ein „best seller" des Jahres werden wird. Es sind die Lebenserinnerungen von Frau Pastor Schaefer, der Redakteurin der „Frauenecke" im „Friedensboten." In ihnen tritt uns Emilie Schaefer entgegen, wie sie leibt und lebt: eine scharfe Beobachterin des kirchlichen und öffentlichen Lebens, mit ihrer Meinung nirgends zurückhaltend, Licht und Schatten gerecht verteilend in ihrem Urteil landläufiger Verhältnisse.

Ihr Herz schlägt warm für die deutsche Sache. Die Leiden des deutschen Vaterlands und besonders der Deutschamerikaner werden eindrücklich und mit wohl ausgeführter Kleinmalerei geschildert. Die edlen Leistungen des „Deutschen Hilfswerks" erfahren gebührende Beachtung. Jedoch auch die Schattenseiten deutschen kirchlichen Lebens hier und drüben werden nicht verschwiegen. Im Gegenteil, sie werden deutlich hervorgehoben, und gelegentlich läßt sich die Verfasserin in begeistertem Tribut an den „englischen Geist," d. i. die Vorzüge des amerikanischen Charakters, zu Uebertreibungen hinreißen. Z. B. sagt sie in einem solchen Zusammenhang, in Amerika stehe alle Arbeit im Zeichen des Dienstes, nicht des Profits. Selbst der Zeitungsjunge verkaufe seine Zeitungen nicht so sehr um des Verdienstes willen, sondern um in dieser nationalen Organisation des Dienstes aller sein bescheiden Teil beizutragen. Als wir dies lasen, fühlten wir uns versucht, mit Festus auszurufen: „Paule, du rasest, die große Kunst macht dich rasend!"

Doch solche kleine Entgleisungen verdienen kaum der Erwähnung. Aufs ganze gesehen, hat sich Verfasserin wohl im Zaum. Ja, ihr trefflich abwägender Gerechtigkeitssinn ist ein Hauptvorzug des Buches. Hier und da mag es Pastoren geben, denen ihre aggressive Art, ihre Offenherzigkeit und bibelfeste Schlagfertigkeit etwas auf die Nerven fällt. Wir dagegen gehören zu denen, welchen diese Eigenschaften an ihr baß gefallen.

Im Unterschied von andern Geschichten fängt Frau Schaefers Lebensbeschreibung mit der Hochzeit an. Sie hat ein bewegtes Leben geführt, und manche interessante Erlebnisse werden mit geschicktem Pinsel aufgetragen. Sie sind nicht nur Schilderungen persönlichen Lebens, sondern werfen helles Licht auf Land und Leute.

Wir zweifeln nicht, daß besonders die Leser der „Frauenecke" sich mit Gusto auf dies Buch werfen werden. Wir erwarten, daß es abgehen wird wie die sprichwörtlichen „warmen Brötchen." Verfasserin hat viel getan, den Frauen unsrer Kirche zu Recht und Anerkennung zu verhelfen. Es wäre daher nur natürlich, wenn die Frauen ihrem Buch zu einem reißenden Absatz die Wege bahnten. Auch von drüben sollten viele Aufträge kommen. Wir versprechen dem Buch einen durchschlagenden Erfolg.

VOLUME 56. MARCH 1928. NUMBER 2.

Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America

Motto: 1. Cor. 3, 22-23.
Πάντα ὑμῶν ἐστίν, ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ.

Published bi-monthly and entered at the post office at St. Louis, Mo., as second-class matter in December, 1898.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October, 1917, authorized on July 3, 1918.

CONTENTS

Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per year (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 9807 Cudell Ave., Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-18 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

VOL. 56. ST. LOUIS, MO. MARCH 1928.

YOUTH AND OUR EVANGELICAL CHURCH

Prof. Henry Katterjohn

The observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of our Evangelical League brought into the focus of our attention the fact, that there has been and still is a "Youth Movement" in our Evangelical Synod. An anniversary always furnishes an opportunity for a comparison of the present with the past. The reports submitted in the form of a "Historical Review" offered ample evidence that our "Youth Movement" has not been without a definite and determining influence upon the development and character of our Evangelical Church. We believe that within these past twenty-five years our spiritual life has been deepened, our interests and activities broadened, the whole church as such brought into a more or less definite conscious relationship to the great problems confronting civilization at large and our own nation in particular. The increasing number of memorials and contributions of our Evangelical League to the great enterprises of our Evangelical Church, which were a characteristic feature of our youth activities from the beginning, are symbolical of our growing interest and loyalty of our young people in and to the cause of the Kingdom of God.

A comparison between the "now" and "then" of our Evangelical League bids us to make a comparison between the movement within our own church, and the "Youth Movement" in Germany.

The movement in Germany was a protest against purposive suppression and ignoring of youth on part of the Church, and was

therefore revolutionary in character. The movement culminated in a great many instances in a direct attempt to break away from the traditional moorings, and launch out upon the unexplored waters of a new religious and social experimentation. The erratic and oft-times phantastic forms which the "Youth Movement" assumed in Germany can be understood only if we interpret them as an open protest against imposed adult supervision and control, and an attempt on the part of the young people to live and function on the level of youth capacity and interest. They tried to discover the dominating interests and normal activities in which young people seeking the Jesus way of living, might normally engage. Undoubtedly mistakes were made, but on the whole the movement did accomplish its end in so far as it emphasized anew the great objective of all religious organization, to provide for an environment in which all, adults and young people and children can have an experience of God. In spite of, or perhaps because of its negative character, this movement did have this positive result. The "Youth Movement" in Germany had as its aim the breaking of the chains of imposed adult control, and the recognition of the right of youth to religious experience commensurate with youth needs and capacity, or in other words, self-realization of the young people.

Our "Youth Movement" sprang from a different motive. The entire young people's movement in America originated from a desire on the part of youth to appropriate and share adult religious experience. The early Christian Endeavor Societies were content to pattern their organization and activities after those of adult forms. Their prayer meetings were adult prayer meetings of a modified type; their committees and even their pledge were taken over from the form of church pledges and church activities. The whole of the Christian Endeavor organization was a miniature of the adult forms. The underlying motive was the desire to arrive at maturity and adulthood as quickly as possible, and for this reason adult forms were retained, and adult experiences copied.

But in seeking this end they failed to experience a continuity of growth in religious experience; there was a decided break in their development. The importance of living and functioning normally at all times, and in all phases of life activities was overlooked.

For this reason our "Youth Movement" which in our Evangelical Church found expression in the Evangelical League, never broke away from the traditional moorings, but used these as an anchorage to stabilize their work, and as a starting place from which they might depart. The movement did not pass through the Storm and Stress experience, that cataclysmic emotional upheaval that has

been characteristic of the German movement. Our young people always welcomed adult leadership and guidance. Perhaps this tendency to link up with adult experience retarded the process of self-realization, but it did bring youth and adults of our Evangelical Church closer together than would have been otherwise possible had antagonism marked their activities. Adults and youth learned how to work together, and in the process of working and living togehter, each made important contributions to the sum total of their experiences, enriching and improving the living process of both.

After all, is this not the desired attitude we must have towards each other? The Kingdom of God is not a complex of diverse elements, but a cooperative enterprise where all age levels meet their needs, and succeed in living to their fullest capacity.

What has the Church as such learned through its contact with young people?

There are five distinct stages in the development of the attitude of the Church towards her young people.

1. The first stage is marked by the *absolute dominance of adulthood,* and *corresponding ignoring of youth.* In this stage human civilization was regarded as existing for the sake of the adults. Adult life is the only worth while life, childhood and youth cannot be evaded, but are to be deplored, and the goal of adulthood must be reached as rapidly as possible. Life was organized as a civilization for such as had arrived at maturity. The institutions, of our civilization, such as government, school, church, are the tools through which those who have arrived at maturity can retain their power to control life situations. Only adulthood assured a rich and abundant life, the life of the child and youth was incomplete, therefore lacking in richness and abundance.

2. The second stage is marked by the *awakening of adult life to the actuality of youth.* Youth is here, *what shall we do with it?* When in the days of the Reformation the religious foundations of beliefs and forms of church organization were shaken to their very depths, and the whole carefully reared structure of church authority was undermined, when the necessity confronted the church to find reenforcement in numbers and followers, then they turned to youth and sought to train them in the ways of the fathers in order that the traditional heritage of the past might be preserved and handed down intact to the coming ages. Luther and the reformers answered the question: "What shall we do with youth?" by founding schools for their instruction, by developing rites in which the rights of youth as an integral part of the whole social fabric were recognized. The Catholic Church responded by the counter-reformation, during which period its school system for children and

youth was created. This recognition of youth as an integral factor in social organization culminated in our public school system, created and supported primarily for the purpose of preserving the heritage of the past, and assuring an unbroken continuity of our civilization. This recognition of youth as an integral part of the human family was accompanied by a long intense searching, covering four hundred years of experimentation and research, after a teaching technique whose observance and practice might facilitate the passing on of this heritage of the human race, the rich experiences and accomplishments of the past. The increasing complexity of human living made this quest after an effective teaching method a most perplexing, yes, almost a fruitless one. The story of Luther, Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Commenius, John Locke and Herbart is the tale of such ardent seeking after means and methods through which youth might be trained in the ways of the fathers, and the heritage of their experiences be preserved unimpaired and unsoiled.

3. The third stage on the relationship of adult to youth is marked by the question: *"What can we do for youth?"* This period might be termed an aftermath of the great struggle which the Civil War involved. In public school education it led to the definite adoption of the free common school system by all of our states; the founding of denominational colleges, the State Universities, and other institutions of learning and training which were factors in equipping youth better for life. The great sacrifice of young manhood, which the Civil War involved, aroused in our citizenship a feeling of appreciation and reverence for youth. The Church also woke up to a consciousness of her responsibility. She felt a compassion for her young people. It was the age of honest altruistic endeavor. We began to lavish affection upon her youth. So-called Institutional Churches providing opportunities for play and recreation were built; religion was made more attractive to young people through the sugar-coating of sensuous pleasures, which resulted not only in a cheapening of religious values, but in the deterioration of religious living as well. The feeling was abroad, that if we would hold our young people for the church, and win them for the religion of Jesus, we must make religion easy for youth.

The result was rather disappointing. Instead of winning youth, we estranged them; instead of strengthening their character, we weakened and demoralized them; instead of enriching their lives, we pauperized them, preventing from having that rich experience that a genetic contact with Jesus alone can give. The enlarged educational opportunities, the scientific approach which was encountered everywhere, the keen competition of commercialized recreational interests, gave our young people not only a different view-

point of life, too often in entire contrast to religious attitudes, but caused them to regard the church as inferior when compared with these other agencies that were engaging their interests. The policy of doing something for young people did not work, it only retarded their growth and developed an attitude of pitying indifference towards the church.

4. The fourth stage is marked by the question: *"What can young people do?"* This was the period of emancipation. There is an attitude of disregard of existing institutions such as the family and the church, a breaking down of discipline. Owing to the increasing complexities of living, the incoming of multiplying interests, parents and leaders felt themselves incompetent to hold taut the reins of discipline. The contact with new viewpoints, the experience of new values, aroused in youth itself a feeling of competency, which looked with disregard upon the experiences and wisdom of a former age. Youth questioned existing social attitudes, customs, traditions, traditional thinking. It is the spirit of youth to challenge the past to fit into the conditions of today, and is applied ruthlessly in every field of human endeavor—in education and religion, economic organization, government, marriage, the family relationship. This tendency to question and disregard authority has led to conflicts, resulting, on the one hand in the disintegration of ethical conduct, the breaking down of morals, the creation of "flappers and sheiks," juvenile delinquency—in religious life we see the breaking down of the old time faith, the glorification of doubt and unbelief; on the other hand we see the despair of the adult leaders, who feel their impotency to cope with the new spirit, and as a result relinquish the attempt to lead. Youth has been in open rebellion against adult leadership. We see it in the students conferences held from time to time, where a sharp cleavage was drawn between youth and adults, indicated in the inhibition of adult counsel and advice. The demand to live their life in the light of their own experience is leading, to excesses which old traditions cannot sanction. The extreme results of this life philosophy are the cigarette smoking girl and the hip-flask-carrying-youth. These are signs of emancipation, and are used not because of their inherent value, but because they signify independence. We have let go of youth because we were unable to impose upon them our adult experience. Not being able to cope with the situation we have adopted a "laissez-faire" policy, "let things drift, all will be well in the end."

But all will not be well. We dare not permit youth to be divorced from adult leadership, or separated and isolated from the sacred heritage and culture of the past. We must adopt a new policy, or attitude towards youth.

5. *We must live with youth,* if we would direct youth. The writer was impressed by a statement made this last summer by a leader of the German Youth Movement. Resenting the attempt of adults to impose their adult experience upon youth, he made the following statement in answer to a question regarding the age of those participating in the Youth Movement, "Of course, the Youth Movement includes also men of advanced age, for we welcome young old people who are ready to live with us." It is not true that youth resents adult leadership. Youth is conscious of its limitations. It has a paucity of experiences, and therefore is lacking the materials out of which general principles are constructed. Conscious of its poverty, youth looks towards a leadership that can supply its wants, and led youth to a more abundant living. But that leadership must be on the level of youth, organically integrated, not separate and distinct, or segmentally differentiated. We adults must live with youth, share her experiences, appreciate, not patronizingly, but sincerely, naturally and automatically, youth's life values. This period of this new adult relationship to youth is just being ushered in. It took the world two thousand years to discover the meaning of Jesus' words; "Except ye become as a little child, ye cannot enter the Kingdom of heaven." Except we become an integrated part of youth life we cannot guide youth's development. There is no segmental development of life, the law of continuity is in effect. We are just beginning to realize that the great human family consists not of mature adults and immature children, but of men, women, youth and children who are all in the process of becoming. We believe in the democracy of God, we must learn to live with each other and for each other.

The result is a change in the definition of religion. Religion is not something external, a matter of intellectual belief, a compliance with certain forms and symbols, but an inner attitude springing from life experiences. There is a change in the definition of the church. It is no longer the adult experience that is the mark of a real Christian. The church is an environment in which every one can have an experience of God, in accordance with his need and capacity. And for the creation of such an environment all of us are necessary, adults, youth and children. We must enable every one to have an experience of God, and this experience is complete at every age level, perfect in degree, providing it measures up to the fullest capacity of the individual. To make this possible we must live with each other, enter into each other's problems not only with sympathy and understanding, but actually, and really, as if they were our problems; appreciate each others needs and interests, live

on the level of love and friendship or gain unity and cooperation. This organic unity of all is necessary in order that the fulness of God may be revealed in the hearts of all, men, women, youth and children.

After all, the experience and guidance of maturity is necessary for the proper growth of youth. We cannot build a Christian society without it. Neither does youth seek to escape this guidance. Modern emancipated youth is not "all right". There is evident a trend towards disintegration which is alarming because it indicates social and moral anarchy. Youth wishes an abundant, orderly way of living.

How can this unity be brought about between youth and adult leadership, involving the acceptance of adult experience?

As a Christian society, we must,

1. Provide for an opportunity to youth to gain a knowledge of this world, the rich heritage of past traditions and experiences, the life situations and life problems involved in the process of livin. Youth must have a concept of reality and truth, must *know life,* living the past as well as the present.

2. We must provide for an opportunity to test out the value of these experiences in the actual living process, that on the basis of what is best youth may create an ideal of what the world ought to be like. This is the concept of the beautiful, the desirable, the ideal. Youth must be helped to *feel* the appeal and value of beautiful living.

3. We must help youth attach such a value to the ideal, that it will so *mold and construct its conduct,* that the world as it is will become the world as it ought to be. This is ethical conduct, the Jesus Way of living.

Youth must have well developed concepts of truth, beauty, and conduct. We must help youth to *know,* to *feel* and to *will* to do that what is in harmony with these two. This is the environment youth must live in, if it is to grow into the righteousness of God, and such an environment can be created only through the process of actually living together on basis of inner unity and cooperation.

The influence springing from this process of living together is not only directed towards the changing or transformation of youth. It also has its effect upon maturity, for maturity is still a process of developing and growing; it is far from being stable and fixed state. In this process of living together youth exerts influence upon maturity, and this is its best and largest contribution that it ultimately will make towards the enriching of the living process. We shall enumerate a few of these contributions without an attempt to be all-inclusive.

1. Youth has discovered the fact, that Christian living is a quest after a better understanding of Jesus Christ. The unsearchable riches of Jesus, steadily unfolding as life progresses, but never quite comprehended, are a challenge to the adventurous spirit of youth, which youth cannot resist. As long as we have not fully comprehended or discovered Jesus, Christian living will ever remain an adventure. The challenge "Come and See," is ever with us. There need be no fear of ever exhausting the mind and power of the challenge of Jesus. The world is turning to Jesus, and youth is going with the world. The fear of the church, as it was, will be forgotten in appreciation of the church which is seeking to provide all with a living contact with the life and experience of the fulness of Jesus.

2. Youth is kindling idealism in adulthood. Adulthood had become fixed and stable in its outlook upon life, as expressed in dogma and forms of belief. Like the church of the Middle Ages, we had no problems, all was settled. Tradition, we said, if preserved, shows the way to successful living. We thought we had comprehended Jesus, understood him perfectly. Youth's enthusiasm over the new discovery of Jesus aroused the dogmatic adult, and he has joined the host of adventurous seekers after Jesus who are discovering the astounding fact that no one has fully comprehended Jesus. He is actually the man, "whom nobody knows." Hitherto we have been satisfied with the existing words of Jesus, now we are trying to discover the lost words of Jesus, the implications involved in his sayings as applied to present day situations. Youth is challenging the world in this adventure of discovery.

3. Youth is preparing the way *for the democracy of God,* the democratizing of the whole world. The concepts "Internationalism," "World Friendship," "World Peace," "Interracial Good-will" are not satisfactory because they do not express the nature of this new world attitude completely. In their very nature they involve differentiation, existing differences, compromises. In the light of Jesus' teachings there exists a "oneness," an organic unity to such a degree that all individualism is lost sight of in the divine unity culminating in God. The consciousness of being "children" of the one "heavenly Father" is essential before we can really have a democracy or Kingdom of God on earth.

4. Youth is preparing the way for a *Christian civilization.* This civilization will be realized not through a revolution, but is a process of steady development and growth. Interpreting the past in the light of present day experiences, we shall widen the influence of Jesus until it embraces all phases of living, and gives direction to all human institutions. This is primarily the task of youth, through

its "growing into life" process. The ultimate Christianizing of business, government, social relations, educational institutions, etc., is not impossible, but ultimately possible in the light of the advancements that have been made in this direction.

5. Youth is demonstrating the meaning of a social gospel, of an order of living in which Jesus is still the leader and source of power for the individual, but where the experience of the individual is linked up with the experience of others and becomes the common stimulus and urge of all, so that all live with each other and for each other in and through the indwelling of the spirit of Jesus Christ. Thus the world shall be saved from the sin of individualism and self-centeredness, and life find its fullest expression through service and sacrifice. "That I might know Him, and the Power of His resurrection" must become the urge, the inner drive of youth.

Youth is seeking, inspite of its freakish conduct, inspite of its errings and wanderings, the abundant life.

Let us join youth, and with youth find the way to the understanding of Jesus.

Living with youth is the only answer to the problem of youth.

EVALUATION OF THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM

By Prof. Philip Vollmer, Ph.D., D.D.

That famous little book, the Heidelberg catechism, should be much better known by the ministers of our Evangelical Synod than it is, mainly for three reasons. In the first place, because it is one of the three official creedal standards of our synod. Article II of the recently revised constitution of our denomination reads:

"The Evangelical Synod of North America, as a part of the Evangelical Church, defines the term 'Evangelical Church' as denoting that branch of the Christian Church which acknowledges the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as the Word of God, the sole and infallible guide of faith and life, and accepts the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures as given in the symbolic books of the Lutheran and the Reformed Church, the most important being: The Augsburg Confession, Luther's and *the Heidelberg Catechisms,* in so far as they agree; but where they disagree The Evangelical Synod of North America adheres strictly to the passages of Holy Scriptures bearing on the subject, and avails itself of the liberty of conscience prevailing in the Evangelical Church."

A second reason why our ministers should acquaint themselves better with the Heidelberg catechism is the increasing sentiment in our Synod in favor of a closer cooperation with the Reformed Church in the United States, commonly called the "German Reformed Church" (in distinction from the *Dutch* Reformed Church), whose sole official creed is the Heidelberg catechism. Article 7 of the constitution of that denomination declares: "A congregation of the Reformed Church in the U. S. is a body of Christians accepting the Bible as the Word of God and the *Heidelberg Catechism* as its standard of faith and doctrine." These statements of both denominations would at the outset offer a common confessional platform for some kind of an effective union between the two churches. Moreover, the Heidelberg Catechism should be known for its own sake, for it is a treasure-house of devotional, theological and homiletical material for the immediate use of ministers. I would therefore urge my younger brethren in the ministry to set apart the forenoons of one or more weeks for a careful reading of the little book, on the basis of this introductory essay, and I will assure them of a considerable amount of inspiration, as well as good texts, seed thoughts and outlines for many a strong sermon.

Reasons for Writing the Heidelberg Catechism

These may best be stated in the form of a brief history of the Reformation in the Palatinate (Pfalz). This country was late in introducing church reforms, though the people were impatient for

them. Finally while the Elector, Frederick II, was still counseling with Melanchthon, the people forced matters. On Sunday, December 20, 1545, when the priest was just preparing to read mass in the Church of the Holy Ghost at Heidelberg, they arose en masse and drowned the priest's voice by singing that stirring Reformation choral: "Es ist das Heil uns kommen her." The priest left the altar, and the Elector acquiesced in the will of the people. On December 25, 1545, in the Castle Chapel, and on January 3, 1546 (six weeks before Luther's death on February 18, 1546), in the Church of the Holy Ghost, the Lord's Supper was celebrated in the Protestant way. After many ups and downs, the succeding Elector, Otto Henry, established the Reformation on a firmer basis by introducing the Church Order of 1556. The type of Protestantism in the Palatinate was a mild Melanchthonian Lutheranism, although men of Zwinglian and Calvinistic leanings were also appointed as professors and preachers. Among the Lutherans was Heshusius, the General Superintendent, a High-Lutheran zealot who soon attacked the Calvinists with great violence, calling the University "a hellish, devilish, cursed, cruel and terrible thing" and excommunicating his Reformed colleague, Prof. Klebitz.

When in 1559, Frederick III, the Pious, ascended the throne he inherited also this quarrel. Born a Roman Catholic, he had become a Lutheran through the influence of his excellent wife, the daughter of the Markgrave of Brandenburg. But he became gradually estranged from Lutheranism, (1) on account of the fanatical violence of Heshusius, whom he finally dismissed, and (2) because his careful study of the Bible and other books had convinced him that Zwingli and Calvin represented a more Biblical, spiritual and ethical type of Protestantism, and that Lutheranism itself was in dire need of a new reformation. The Lutheran party became so alarmed that the Elector's own wife asked her son-in-law, the Elector of Saxony, to have prayers said in his churches that God might keep Frederick in the "true faith." But in 1560 he had already accepted Melanchthon's "consensus formula" on the Lord's Supper and after the Naumburg Diet, in 1561, the veneration of the Virgin, the adoration of the host, Lenten rules, images, altars, baptismal fonts, and even organs were abolished, and bread was substituted for the wafer. He also insisted on a more thorough ethical reformation which should manifest itself in love, tolerance, purity, temperance, etc. As Dr. Geo. W. Richards in his recent book on the Heidelberg Catechism, puts it: "The term 'Reformed' had its point turned against Lutheranism, rather than against Catholicism." The final step in introducing Calvinism was the publication of the Heidelberg Catechism, followed by a liturgy, a Church Order, and a Book of Discipline.

The Authors of the Heidelberg Catechism

Frederick chose two young men to write the Catechism: Zacharius Ursinus, a pupil of Melanchthon, 28 years old, and Caspar Olevianus, a pupil of Calvin, 26 years old. Ursinus (Latin for "Baer") was born at Breslau, in 1534, studied under Melanchthon at Wittenberg, travelled in Switzerland and France and in 1558 became professor at Breslau. But here his Reformed views aroused opposition and he had just decided to go "to the Zurichers" when in 1561 a call to Heidelberg came. After a life full of work, struggle and adversity he died in 1583, and lies buried in the church at Neustadt an der Hardt. The Reformed Church in the United States has erected a tablet to his memory near his resting place.—*Olevianus* ("von der Olewig") was born in Treves in 1536, studied law at Bourges, France; turned to theology, influenced by a miraculous rescue from drowning, and then studied under Calvin, Peter Martyr in Zurich, and Beza in Louvaine; preached in Treves, and when the Protestants were expelled he accepted a call to Heidelberg. He ended his life at Herborn in 1587, where he is buried. A tablet erected by the Reformed Church in the U. S. marks his resting place.

The Exact Method of Writing the Catechism

It is difficult to say with absolute accuracy what in the catechism belongs to the one author, and what to the other, for the book is so absolutely harmonious and synthetical throughout. This, however, seems to have been the method. A commission was appointed, consisting as Frederick says, of "the whole theological Faculty, all the superintendents and principal ministers." This commission assigned the task of preparing the book in Latin to Ursinus (as appears from a comparison with Ursinus' "Catechesis Minor"). Then it was revised and translated into German by Olevianus, so that to this great orator are due the classical diction, the happy phrasing and the musical cadences of the book. But the Elector himself also took an active part, as he testified before the Augsburg Diet in 1566: "I can prove by my own handwriting that after receiving the catechism from my theologians, I corrected it in several places." When completed, the catechism was examined and revised by a Synod held in January, 1563, at Heidelberg for eight days, closing on January 17th, with the Lord's Supper according to the Reformed manner. With the exception of the Superintendent of Ingelheim, the whole Synod signed the book.

On Monday, January 18, the Synod had an audience in the famous Heidelberger Schloss, when the Elector expressed his gratitude for their work, and on January 19, 1563, the Elector wrote the vigorous preface himself.

Sources and Plan of the Heidelberg Catechism

The Heidelberg Catechism is not the result of a sudden inspiration, but a careful compilation in the good sense of the word. Its authors had a rich catechetical literature before them, both Lutheran and Reformed. Dr. J. I. Good in his recent works has in a skillful manner traced much of the material of Questions 1, 21, 32, 54, 60, and others, back to the Catechisms of Leo Juda," of Bullinger, of Calvin, of Lasco, and others. Ursinus himself had written two works in Latin, "Summa Theologiae," and "Catechesis Minor," and Olevianus is believed to have published a writing on the "Covenant of Grace" though no trace of it can be found.

The *outline* of the Heidelberg Catechism is based on the three divisions of Romans, Man's Misery, Man's Deliverance, Man's Thankfulness. The use of Paul's plan was very likely suggested to the authors by Melanchthon's "Loci Communes" and Luther's "Short Form" of 1520. Ursinus' "Smaller Catechism" is also based on it. Thus Max Goebel is hardly saying too much when he writes, "The Heidelberg Catechism may in the true sense of the term be considered the flower and fruit of the whole German and French Reformation. It has Lutheran inwardness, Melanchthon clearness, Zwinglian simplicity, and Calvinistic fire, harmoniously blended."

The external form of the Heidelberg Catechism has been somewhat changed in later editions. When first published in 1563 the questions were not numbered, nor divided into Sunday lessons; the proof texts were placed on the margin, instead of below the text, and cited only by chapter. The first edition does not contain Question 80 on the mass; in the second edition we find the first part of Question 80, a clear objective definition of what the mass is, introduced by the Elector, because "admonished by me," as Olevianus writes to Calvin on April 3, 1563; the third edition added the vigorous denunciation of the mass as "an accursed idolatry," very likely in answer to the anathemas hurled against Protestantism by the Council of Trent just then in session. (See Prof. Hinke in Ref. Church Review, April, 1913, P. 165)

The Type of Doctrine of the Heidelberg Catechism

As over against Romanism the Heidelberg Catechism is Protestant to the core, as is seen by an examination of the questions on justification by faith, good works, faith, purgatory, the invocation of the saints, the use of images, the mass, etc. (61-64, 91, 57, 30, 94, 96, 80.) As over against Socinian unitarianism and the Anabaptists it is thoroughly evangelical, teaching Christ's essential deity, the trinity, infant baptism, respect for civil government, (33, 75, 101, 104). As over against Lutheranism, it is genuinely Calvinistic, as is evident from its teaching on the Sacraments, on church discipline, its denial of the ubiquity of the glorified body of Christ;

its distinction between the visible and the invisible church (54, 83, to 85). "Its Calvinism, however, has none of those angularities, and excesses which now and then have detracted from the dignity of a noble system of thought. Little is said about the decrees, and nothing about any decree of reprobation" (Smellie). Predestination underlies Questions 1, 31, 54, etc. It contained enough of it to comfort the believing soul, but not enough to excite the controversial spirit. The question has often been raised in the Reformed Church whether the Heidelberg Catechism in its type of teaching was Melanchthonian or Calvinistic. To me it seems that while the Heidelberg Catechism is genuinely Calvinistic, its Calvinism is tempered by the Melanchthonian-Lutheran soil from which it sprang, both as to place and authors, and by the influence of the German spirit. It would be an anomaly of history if Calvinism in Germany were of the self-same type as that of Scotland, Holland and New England. In many respects, the Heidelberg Catechism is truly a "Union Catechism."

The Heidelberg Catechism and Lutheranism

As our Evangelical Synod holds with firmness and conviction to the principle of evangelical union concerning the distinguishing doctrines of the Reformed and Lutheran churches, the attitude of the Heidelberg Catechism to Lutheranism may therefore be of special interest in view of the fact that our synod comprises advocates of either views. As the time of its origin was a period of hot controversy, it was only natural that the Heidelberg Catechism should clearly differentiate the doctrinal position of the Reformed type from that of the Lutherans, especially on the sacraments, on Christ and on the Church. It does this, however, in a moderate tone and without polemical zeal.

A sharp distinction is drawn in the Heidelberg Catechism between the external signs of the sacraments and the spiritual realities which they symbolize. These realities are not bound up with nor communicated through the material elements. They are merely symbolized and sealed by the visible elements—water bread and wine (Ques. 69 and 75). Luther's Small Catechism says: "Baptism worketh forgiveness of sin, delivers from death and the devil, and gives everlasting salvation to all who believe this." But the Heidelberg Catechism makes a sharp distinction between the symbolizing function of water and the regenerating activity of the Holy Spirit (Question 60-74). We are washed with Christ's blood and spirit not because we are baptized, but we are baptized because we have been already washed by Christ's spirit. In the Lord's Supper, the body and blood of Christ are not in, with and under the bread and wine to be received by worthy and unworthy alike, as the Lutherans believe, but the eating is spiritual, by faith, and the union in the

sacrament is mystical, not by a corporeal real presence. Thus the sacraments, according to the Heidelberg Catechism are confirmatory and symbolic of direct acts of God done independently of the sacraments (Condensed from "The Heidelberg Catechism, by Pres. G. W. Richards).

The Pervading Spirit of the Heidelberg Catechism

Well-earned praise has been bestowed on the wise moderation and the temper of sweet reasonableness of the Heidelberg Catechism. The book is never offensively polemical and displays no rancor or intolerance. Only with regard to Question 80 it has become the fashion to lament the denunciation of the mass as "an accursed idolatry" as too harsh and uncharitable. But when one remembers that the mass is the very citadel and root of the Romish corruption and perversion in all its features, then and now, the characterization of it in words taken from Paul (Gal. 1: 8-9) may be pardoned at a time when the Council of Trent was just in session condemning the Reformation. Dr. Lang says: "The sharp tone of its polemics against Rome enhances, in my estimation, the value of the Catechism."

The Stormy Reception of the Heidelberg Catechism

A terrific storm broke loose when the Heidelberg Catechism appeared in print. Lutheran princes and theologians opposed it vehemently. At the Augsburg Diet of 1566 the Elector was threatened with the loss of his territory, because only the adherents of the Lutheran Augsburg Confession enjoyed religious liberty. The mystic number 666 in Revelation was applied to it, because it contained as many errors. But on May 14, 1566 the Elector made such an impressive defense of the Heidelberg Catechism offering to lay down his life for the truth as seen by him, that the Emperor in his broken German said to him: "Nit kop ab; nit kop ab, lieber Fuerst," and several of his opponents shook hands with him, saying: "Fritz, du bist froemmer als wir."

The Spread of the Heidelberg Catechism

But in spite of all opposition the Heidelberg Catechism made its way, owing to its intrinsic worth. It has been translated into more than twenty European and Asiatic tongues. After the Bible, the Imitation of Christ by Thomas a Kempis, and Pilgrim's Progress no book can rival the Heidelberg Catechism in the number of its versions. Thus while its original purpose was to provide a creed and a textbook for a provincial church only, it very soon became a bond between all the Reformed and several of the Presbyterian and union churches throuhgout the world—an ecumenical creed. It was gradually adopted by the other Reformed Churches in Germany, by several Swiss Cantons (St. Gall, Schaffhausen, Berne); by the Synod of Dort (1618) by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian

Church in the United States, by Holland, Hungary, by Prussia, etc. The Heidelberg Catechism was first brought to America in 1609 by the Dutch, before Presbyterians, Lutherans and Puritans had arrived. By its intrinsic value it gradually displaced all but one (the Westminster Shorter Catechism) of the Reformed Catechisms, and is today one of the three catechisms of the Reformation period, which, as the fittest, have survived the dozens formerly in use. (Luther's Smaller Catechism, Westminster Shorter). A volume might easily be filled with golden opinions and praises of the Heidelberg Catechism. One may suffice. Bishop Hall, one of the British delegates to the Synod of Dort in 1619, said of the Heidelberg Catechism, after he had returned home: "Our Reformed brethren on the continent have a little book whose single leaves are not to be bought with tons of gold." As stated before, the Heidelberg Catechism is one of the three official confessions of our Evangelical Synod.

Comparison with the Westminster Shorter Catechism

Next in importance to the Heidelberg Catechism and Luther's Small Catechism is the Westminster Shorter Catechism of the Presbyterian Churches and it may therefore be of interest to compare these two books. Both agree on the fundamentals of the Calvinistic system. As to form the Westminster has the merit of greater brevity as to questions and answers. The questions of the Westminster Catechism are impersonal in the third person singular or first person plural), while in the Heidelberg Catechism about 37 questions and answers are in the first or second person singular, making them more personal. The catechumen is addressed as a baptized church member who answers the question from his present or prospective religious experience. A merit of the Westminster Catechism over the Heidelberg Catechism is that the question is embodied in the answer, thus making a full definition. As to their underlying principle, the Westminster Catechism is based on the Covenants (see Ques. 12 and 20), while the Heidelberg Catechism is built up on the creed (36 questions). As to spirit, the Westminster Catechism is more theological, a model of clear precise, logical definition, but more addressed to the head, while the Heidelberg Catechism is more experimental, more addressed to the feelings. (See first questions in both catechisms) Dr. Smellie's praise is almost too fulsome and the more to be valued because from the Presbyterian side. He writes in his "Books for the Heart" as follows: "Calvin's Catechism and that of the Westminster divines lack the element of poetry altogether, however excellent they are in other respects. Their authors have chosen the objective method, stating the truth in the form of dogma, looking at it for the time as some-

thing outside themselves, examining it dispassionately with reason and intellect, setting it forth in language as crystal-clear and definite as that in which men of science embody the results of their investigations. The writers of the Palatinate on the other hand, choose the subjective method, telling to others with gladness what has touched and transfigured their own souls, refusing to be impersonal in the statement of their cherished beliefs, making their words a joyous confession of the faith which is in themselves. The books of Geneva and Westminster are like statues—accurate, well-proportioned, impressive, but immobile and somewhat cold. The book of Heidelberg is like a living man. Some of the features of the man may not be so unerringly cut as those of the statue; but he has within him that of which it is destitute—a beating pulse and a quivering heart."

HAS THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM OUTLIVED ITS USEFULNESS?

Not as a statement of the Reformed faith to be received by the office holders of the church, "for substance of doctrine." But as text-book for the young it was never entirely satisfactory, for as early as 1588 a Shorter Heidelberg Catechism was published in the very land of its birth. Since then the hundreds of simplified editions testify to the great love for the book as well as to its inadequacy as a textbook. No textbook on any subject written 350 years ago can fully meet the wants of the present day. What is wanted in the Reformed and other Churches is a briefer textbook, based on the entire Bible, couched as far as possible, in the language of the Bible, with brief questions and direct short and pithy answers: teaching Bible truth and attacking error from the modern viewpoint.

THE PRESSING NEED OF ALL CHURCHES IN AMERICA

is a genuine revival of catechisation by the pastor, conducted during at least six months of every year and once or twice in every week. This is the Biblical, most reasonable, and most effective method for holding the rising generation in the church and for preempting their young pliable minds and hearts before error has prejudiced them against the Bible. If this revival will not soon set in with power, the church will lose millions of the rising generation; for while the pastor may neglect so plain a duty, the opponents of the church use the press in all its forms, also in the form of catechisms and every other opportunity for sowing tares.

A BRIEF BIBLIOGRAPHY

Inexpensive editions of the Heidelberg Catechism may be ordered from our Eden Publishing House; Geo. W. Richard, the Heidelberg Catechism; A. Smellie, Books for the Heart; Church Review, April, 1913; A. Lang, Der Heidelberger Katechismus.

THE LAUSANNE CONFERENCE: IMPRESSIONS OF A METHODIST LAYMAN

FRANK A. HORNE, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

The Christian Church at Lausanne brought its idealism and realism face to face, and the task of the Conference was to visualize and harmonize these contrasts. The ideals of unity, simplicity and spirituality, which characterized Christ and his early followers and which are clearly the will of God, met and challenged the painful reality of a divided, complex and ineffective church of today. We Methodists in contrition must confess the sin of disunion in our own family of Wesley, as well as in the larger fellowship of Christ. The impress of our essential spirit is thereby diluted and restricted, and the composite contribution which others, in the separation, might make likewise is denied to us and to the whole body of Christ in the present divided household of faith.

The first intimate knowledge of the writer concerning Lausanne was in connection with the work of the American Committee. At that time, under the inspiring leadership of Bishop Brent, a group of American laymen undertook the special financing necessary. Among these men were Charles E. Hughes, George W. Wickersham, James H. Post, William C. Breed, William Cooper Proctor, George Zabriski, Clifford W. Barnes, and other prominent laymen of all communions. To these practical men Christian unity and its effect on the church of tomorrow loomed large. Theological differences and ecclesiastical difficulties seem insignificant to the laymen in their enthusiasm for real unity.

When Lausanne was reached a different situation confronted us. As a layman I was instructed, interested and impressed by the proceedings, but found myself continually inquiring why theological technicalities and ancient traditions occupied such a prominent place, in the face of the great objective of a united Christendom and the need of the world of today and tomorrow.

WAS THE CONFERENCE A SUCCESS?

The question very properly has been raised: "Was the Conference a success?" While it is too soon for a final and correct appraisal of the results, it is not too early to discuss immediate reactions regarding the Conference, and to give first impressions. The great leaders of the Conference with singular unanimity affirm that it was a success.

Bishop Brent says, "The great thing is that it has happened. Never before in history has such a wide-spread attempt in the direction of God's will for unity been made. New friendships have been formed, horizons have been broadened, a great vision has been opened up to us."

Doctor Cadman states, "Never before in the history of Christendom has so widespread an attempt been made to fulfill God's will for the unity of his children. It made no attempt to destroy creeds or ecclesiastical barriers. It did not dream of coercing the conscience either of individuals or of groups. It was content to state agreements and differences in a wise and amicable temper."

Bishop McConnell in the Pittsburgh Christian Advocate reports, "The success lay not in any declarations themselves, but in the spirit which presided over all the discussions. I have been attending bodies for forty years, and never have I seen an important group where such exalted themes were up for discussion which showed anything of the fineness of spirit which characterized the Lausanne meeting. I am sure that the temper of the Lausanne Conference was nothing short of a spiritual miracle. In the best of temper the representatives of the different points of view advanced conceptions which at least seemed utterly opposed to one another, and yet did so in such fashion that the very discussion of the opposed positions, contradictory to one another as they might seem, contained the promise that a solution might ultimately be found."

Some of the editors of the church press of our own and other denominations who were not present evidently believe the Conference was a failure. Doctor Norwood, pastor of Saint Bartholomew's, of New York, in a recent sermon called the Conference a "pathetic failure." He was not present, or he would not have misrepresented the spirit of the Conference as he did in his sermon. If it was expected that the Conference would, in three weeks, reach agreements, compose differences, set up an organization and propose new articles of faith and order, then it was a failure, but if it was to be a council of better understanding, a deterrent of further division and a real beginning of ultimate unity, it was an unqualified success. The work of the Continuation Committee and what the great communions will do with the urgent subject of Christian unity will have much to do with future accomplishment and realization. As Bishop Brent says, "Unity begins in an inner attitude of mind and soul which ultimately mounts into the formation of a new character or disposition. It is for the churches, in cities and hamlets alike, to heed the spirit of Lausanne and to study, with minds steeped in the love of God as made known in Jesus Christ, the reports presented for their consideration."

There are certain factors which should be given special consideration in forming personal or corporate judgments and in rating the values of the Conference. The composition of the Conference must be remembered. There were five hundred delegates present from ninety independent self-governing churches, representing twenty-six countries. All of the great communions were represented

by delegates except the Roman Catholic Church and the Baptist Churches of Great Britain, based upon an invitation that was all inclusive.

Visualize the racial and language barriers, the dissimilarity of historic and traditional backgrounds, the divergent theological groups with doctrines and practices rooted back in the centuries. All of these conditions must be in our thinking in forming our conclusions as to the success of the Conference. Furthermore, it is apparent that such a council could not have been constituted otherwise, in any real attempt to face the problem.

Before forming your judgment, have in mind the procedure of the Conference. From the beginning it did not propose to adopt practical measures, but to seek agreements and discuss differences in order if possible to overcome them. All findings required unanimous consent, and even one negative vote was sufficient to alter, amend or eliminate any statement. The widest latitude was given for the expression of differences as well as agreements. Reports were not adopted and recommended to the churches, but received and referred to the constituent bodies. There was a definite disinclination on the part of many groups to accept federation or any other substitute for unity itself.

Impressions of a Lay Delegate

The personnel of the Conference was impressive. A perusal of the Who's Who of the membership discloses the names of the great leaders of the churches, prominent ecclesiastics, divines, and many eminent theological professors. The delegates were for the most part men past middle life and confined largely to the clergy. The writer made a count from the final membership list and found there were twenty-three laymen as we regard them, and eight women delegates. Probably less than half a dozen representatives of the younger generation under, say, forty years of age were present. The women made an effective protest, securing representation on the Continuation Committee, and one young minister vigorously expressed the attitude of the younger generation in a forward looking declaration.

Probably the outstanding impression of the Conference was its spirit and atmosphere. This was experienced and commented upon constantly by visitors and delegates alike. Throughout the entire time and at the great public meetings the dominant and compelling idea of unity was preeminent, persistent and potential.

The devotional periods were well attended and a pervasive spiritual tone was characteristic throughout the entire Conference. The hymns were sung and the Lord's Prayer repeated in three lan-

guages, with a new sense of one Father and one family. The attitude of the delegates was most fraternal and harmonious and even the most profound differences were discussed in a spirit of courtesy and tolerance. Respect for each other's conscience and convictions was fundamental.

Another distinct impression was the wisdom and courage exhibited by the leaders in facing and dealing with the great divisive questions of the ages, touching the nature of the church, the creeds, the ministry, the sacraments and the relation of the existing churches to unity. No issue was dodged, evaded or ignored, but all was brought out in the light of frank and full discussion and consideration. The great agreement reached by the Conference made a profound impression on all and themselves fully justified the convocation. They are very significant when one considers the variety of religious opinion and ecclesiastical organizations of the men who framed them.

The preamble, which includes the Call to Unity prepared by Bishop Brent; "The Message of the Church—The Gospel," and many portions of other reports, received a unanimous vote. The following ringing declaration from the reports on "The Church's Message—The Gospel," was stirring and effective, and registers a modern note which is most significant. Our Bishop McConnell was vice-chairman of this section and his influence can be readily detected.

"The gospel is the sure source of power for social regeneration. It proclaims the only way by which humanity can escape from those class and race hatreds which devastate society, at present, into the enjoyment of national well-being and international friendship and peace. It is also a gracious invitation to the non-Christian world, East and West, to enter into the joy of the living Lord. Sympathizing with the anguish of our generation, with its longing for intellectual sincerity, social justice, and spiritual inspirations, the church in the eternal gospel meets the needs and fulfills the God-given aspirations of the modern world. Consequently, as in the past, so also in the present, the gospel is the only way of salvation. Thus, through his church, the living Christ still says to men, 'Come unto me. He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.' "

The frankness and fulness of statements of differences and the fairness in presenting all sides of a question were most striking to all observers. The strength of the Evangelical position in all these statements stood out boldly and seemed to a layman as most convincing. Those of contrary and more traditional views were apparently surprised at the insistence of the Evangelicals for their position and were placed continually on the defensive, particularly with regard to ancient beliefs and exclusive rites.

The following brief excerpts from the reports will illustrate the very frank and fearless discussion of differences:

1. From the report on "The Church's Common Confession of Faith."

"It must be noted also that some of the churches represented in this Conference conjoin traditions with the Scriptures, some are explicit in subordinating Creeds to the Scriptures, some attach a primary importance to their particular Confessions, and some make no use of Creeds."

2. From the report on "The Nature of the Church."

"Some hold that the visible expression of the church was determined by Christ himself and is therefore unchangeable; others that the one church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit may express itself in varying forms. Some hold that one or other of the existing churches is the only true church; others that the church as we have described it is to be found in some or all of the existing communions taken together."

3. From the report on "The Ministry of the Church."

"These differences concern the nature of the ministry (whether consisting of one or several orders), the nature of ordination, and of the grace conferred thereby, the function and authority of Bishops, and the nature of Apostolic succession. We believe that the first step toward the overcoming of these difficulties is the frank recognition that they exist, and the clear definition of their nature. It is essential that the acceptance of any special form of ordination as the regular and orderly method of introduction into the ministry of the church for the future should not be interpreted to imply the acceptance of any one particular theory of the origin, character or function of any office in the church, or to involve the acceptance of any adverse judgment on the validity of ordination in those branches of the church universal that believe themselves to have retained valid and apostolic orders under other forms of ordination; or as disowning or discrediting a past or present ministry of the Word and Sacrament which has been used and blessed by the Spirit of God."

4. From the report on "The Sacraments."

"There are among us divergent views, especially as to (1) the mode and manner of the presence of our Lord; (2) the conception of the commemoration and the sacrifice; (3) the relation of the elements to the Grace conveyed; and (4) the relation between the minister of this Sacrament and the validity and efficacy of the rite. We are aware that the reality of the divine presence and gift in this Sacrament cannot be adequately apprehended by human thought or expressed in human language."

"We close this statement with the prayer that the differences which prevent full communion at the present time may be removed."

Another outstanding result of the discussions which distinctly impressed me was the essential unity and agreement of the Evangelical and non-Catholic churches or divisions. Minor differences in organization and polity seemed to disappear in a new brotherhood of understanding.

I now come to a rather discouraging observation concerning the Conference, which was not unexpected, but nevertheless seems to stand in the way of any complete union of Christendom in the near future. It is the present apparently insuperable differences between the Anglo-Catholic churches and the Evangelical denominations. Likewise there is the inevitable cleavage between the established and free churches, which indicates a difficult situation. No one at Lausanne, except possibly a small group, seemed to take seriously the opinion of Bishop Manning, repeated in a recent sermon, that the Anglican churches in England and in the United States hold the key to the reunion of the Catholic churches and the Protestant denominations because of their position between the two divisions. The Roman church logically declined to participate in the Conference. The Greek Orthodox Church represented throughout the sessions consistently requested to be excused from voting on the controversial topics. The Anglo-Catholics, however, of the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church, had rather a hard time in maintaining their position and combating the preponderance of opposing views. The differences in the Church of England, and to some extent in the Protestant Episcopal Church, were quite apparent directly and indirectly. The real issue was not joined in the plenary sessions until the report was presented from Section 7 on the Relation of Existing Churches to the United Church. Here at last the Conference was facing the future and the report deals with the matter seemingly in a most reasonable and constructive fashion. Although representatives of the Anglican-Episcopal communion were well represented on the section dealing with the subject, it so happened they were largely of the liberal party. Without attempting to suggest amendments or offering a statement of the opposing views, which was in order, at the instance of Bishop Manning, of New York, a motion was made to recommit the whole report. After discussion, and some protest because of this unusual procedure, only nine votes were registered in favor of the motion. The rest of the house, perhaps of three hundred delegates, voted to the contrary. The ground of the opposition to the report sponsored by Bishop Manning, of New York, and Bishop Gore, of England, was that it would offend and make impossible approaches for unity to the Roman Catholic Church. The much discussed difference on the last day was a similar episode and really represented

the open opposition of two members of the high church party of the Protestant Episcopalians of the United States with respect to final action of this same report on the Relation of Existing Churches to the United Church. Their action was repudiated by the Evangelical branch of their own communion. This difficulty was overcome by the Conference voting to receive the report and referring it to the Continuation Committee for revision and restatement. These incidents revealed the very small minority who held to their views.

The Catholic movement is said to be spreading in the Church of England and the breach there reported as becoming very pronounced and serious. The writer has it on the authority of a well-informed clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church that the Catholic party in this country, with respect to the ministers, represents about thirty percent of their clergy, while in England the proportion of the Catholic party in the clergy is about sixty percent. The laity would not register as high a percentage, it is thought, in either country. The recent Anglo-Catholic Congress of the Protestant Episcopal Church, meeting at Albany, N. Y., indicates that the tendency of the Catholic party is toward Rome rather than to Protestantism. The growth of the Catholic movement and its development "through the stage of 'ritualism' to eucharistic devotions and extra-liturgical observances" was discussed at the Congress and the goal said to be "the reunion of the Catholic Church of Jesus Christ." Where the sympathy and ultimate destination of the Evangelical party of the Episcopal Church lies can be easily imagined. It would appear, therefore, that any unity between those who hold the Catholic position and the Evangelical communions is most impossible at the present time.

My own realization of the great remoteness of any possible merger between Protestantism and the Roman Catholic Church or with those going that way in doctrine and worship was greatly accentuated by my recent visit to Italy and Rome. It is also evident by the reported action of the Vatican in suppressing Father Sanson, the popular priest of Notre Dame, because of liberal tendencies, and the reported movement in the Roman Church to restore the temporal power of the Pope.

What Are the Next Steps?

It would seem that there are two ways of following up the work of Lausanne and keeping the ideals of Christian unity before the churches; first, by the Continuation Committee perpetuating and keeping alive the work of Lausanne and arranging another World Conference at the proper time with the expectation that a newer generation will advance the cause from the splendid begin-

ning now made; and second, to deal with the great subject from the bottom up by seriously attempting to bring together religious bodies of similar types. At Lausanne, in informal circles, there was considerable discussion of the possibility of a union with such bodies as the Congregationalists, the Presbyterians, the Methodists, the Reformed churches, and possibly other denominations. The success of the United Church of Canada, which was brought prominently forward at Lausanne, was cited as an example of what might occur in the United States and elsewhere. It may be that the shortest route for unity between the two Methodisms of the United States would be by the way of this larger amalgamation.

Suppose this should happen in the United States, considering only the larger denominations in each group, it would mean that the United Church would have 11,000,000 members out of 27,500,000 Protestants, or about forty percent of the total. If a world-wide merger were undertaken, figured on the basis of adherents and dealing with the total of the respective groups, there would be a constituency of 68,000,000 adherents, one half of which (or 34,000,000) would be in North America. Consider what could be accomplished with such a united body, in the field of our competing city and rural work; in the consolidated equipment and trained staff possible in the several communities; in the influence and power with respect to public opinion and the attitude of the church on great social and international questions; and in the mission fields of the church. The significance and importance of such a movement would be challenging to the young generation, inspiring to Christianity at large, and set up processes that might ventuate in ultimate complete unity. Our own General Conference at Kansas City next May might well take suitable action by the appointment of a commission or otherwise to consider Christian unity and confer with like commissions of other communions.

Lausanne was a prophecy in part of the church that is to be in the declarations which repeatedly found utterance as to the essential conditions which must be realized. The preponderance of sentiment was that the unity sought must be rich in diversity and not hampered by uniformity. It must provide for freedom of understanding interpretation and expression of religious truth and grant great liberty in the manner and mode of worship. It must forever place spiritual values and militant Christianity in the world it serves above all form, ceremony and ecclesiastical impedimenta whatsoever. *Methodist Review.*

Die ältere liberale Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert.

Von Prof. Dr. R. H. Grützmacher.

I.

Schleiermacher proklamierte die Unabhängigkeit der Theologie und Philosophie. In Wirklichkeit machte er seine Theologie von philosophischen Voraussetzungen abhängig, die er allerdings meist selbst geschaffen hatte. Sein großer persönlicher und sachlicher Gegner an der Berliner Universität, der Philosoph **Hegel** (1770—1831) wollte dagegen Vernunft und Religion und infolgedessen Theologie und Philosophie miteinander verbinden. Er erklärte einmal: „Der Zweck dieser Vorlesung war die Vernunft zu versöhnen mit der Religion." Er fügte seinem philosophischen System eine Behandlung der gesamten Religionsgeschichte und des Christentums ein, die besonders auf die Entstehung der älteren liberalen Theologie gewirkt hat. Nur im Hinblick auf diese theologische Auswirkung ist hier von **Hegels Ideen** zu reden. Im Gegensatz zu Schleiermacher ist Hegel Intellektualist. Im Denken erfassen wir die Wirklichkeit, wie sie objektiv ist. Infolgedessen erkennt der philosophische Denker alle Erscheinungen in ihrem tatsächlichen Sein, einschließlich der religiösen Tatbestände und zwar nicht nur in dieser Welt, sondern auch in der transzendenten. Auch Gott ist im menschlichen Denken erfaßbar. Philosophie und Theologie haben darum denselben Inhalt nämlich den absoluten Geist oder Gott, aber in verschiedener Form. Die Religion und die Theologie erfassen Gott nur in anschaulich-bildlich-mythischer Form, die noch zahlreiche Widersprüche für das Denken enthält: „Im Glauben ist wohl schon der wahrhaftige Inhalt, aber es fehlt ihm noch die Form des Denkens." Ihre Herstellung durch Ausbildung klarer entsprechender harmonischer und geistiger Begriffe vollzieht die Philosophie. „Der wahrhafte christliche Glaubensinhalt ist zu rechtfertigen durch die Philosophie nicht durch die Geschichte." — **Durch dieses Programm hat Hegel eine Umdeutung und eine Auflösung des kirchlichen Dogmas angebahnt und seine historischen Bestandteile und Glaubensgedanken durch allgemeine philosophische Ideen und rationale Begriffe ersetzt.** Gerade in dieser Methode ist ihm die ältere liberale Theologie gefolgt und hat sie konkret durchgeführt.

Für Hegel trägt Gott und die Welt nicht den Charakter ruhenden Seins, sondern denjenigen steter Entwicklung. Nicht nur die Welt, sondern auch Gott entwickelt sich, das heißt Gott entfaltet in einer zusammenhängenden zielstrebigen Bewegung, die in der Form von Thesis, Antithesis, Synthesis, erfolgt, sein Wesen und sein Bewußtsein bis zur höchsten Vollendung. Die Entwicklung Gottes

in und mit der Welt geht zunächst durch die Natur und wandert dann durch die Reiche des Geistes. In dem letzteren wird eine Sphäre des subjektiven, des objektiven und des absoluten Geistes von einander unterschieden. Der absolute Geist bewegt sich in stetig steigender Offenbarung von der Kunst zur Religion und von dieser zur Philosophie aufwärts. Auch innerhalb der Religionsgeschichte besteht eine immer deutlicher steigende Entwicklung in welcher sich Gott stetig reiner offenbart und damit seiner selbst immer klarer bewußt wird. In seinen früheren Veröffentlichungen unterschied Hegel die natürliche Religion, die Kunstreligion und die offenbarte Religion; in seinen späteren Darlegungen differenzierte er die einzelnen Religionen noch schärfer und gab jeder geschichtlichen Religion als Aufgabe die Verwirklichung einer besondern Idee.

In diese einheitliche religionsgeschichtliche Entwicklung gehört nach Hegel auch das Christentum. Es ist nicht nur die höchste, sondern auch die vollendete, ja absolute und unüberbietbare Form der Religion. Denn im Christentum gelangt der Begriff der Religion: „Selbstbewußtsein Gottes im Menschengeist" zu voller Klarheit und Wirklichkeit. Im geschichtlichen Christus kommt als dem Gottmenschen die an und für sich bestehende Einheit zwischen Gottheit und Menschheit zu vollendetem Bewußtsein und zur geschichtlichen das heißt zur anschaulichen mythischen Darstellung. **So versucht Hegel sowohl den Zusammenhang wie die Eigenart des Christentums zu wahren und seine geschichtliche Erscheinung als Ausdruck einer philosophischen Idee zu werten.** Bei einer solchen stetig steigenden geradlinigen Entwicklung in der Welt, besonders in der Religionsgeschichte kann von einer wirklich gegensätzlichen Macht in sittlicher und rationeller Hinsicht nicht die Rede sein. Infolgedessen ist die **Sünde** bei Hegel nicht nur ein notwendiger Durchgangspunkt, sondern eine wertvolle Triebkraft in der sittlichen Höherentwicklung der Menschheit. „Der Sündenfall ist der ewige Mythus des Menschen, wodurch er eben Mensch ward." So wenig wie der Sündenfall ist im Grunde auch die Versöhnung eine einmalige geschichtliche Tatsache, die Neues schafft. Sie ist nur die plastische Darstellung der an sich bestehenden ewigen monistischen Einheit zwischen Gottheit und Menschheit. „Es muß dem Menschen die an sich seiende Einheit der göttlichen und menschlichen Natur in gegenständlicher Weise offenbart werden."

Das soziale Produkt der Christentumsgeschichte ist zunächst die **Kirche**; diese soll aber nur Mittel zu dem Zweck sein, die ganze menschliche Gesellschaft sittlich-religiös zu beeinflussen. Die höchste Form ist der Rechts- und Kulturstaat, in dem auch alle Sittlichkeit und Religion ihre höchste Sozialform findet, sodaß sich die Kirche in ihm idealer Weise auflösen soll. **Vor allem durch den Entwicklungsgedanken und seine Anwendung auf die Religionsgeschichte**

und das Christentum hat Hegel den Grund gelegt für die den theologischen Liberalismus charakterisierende Entwicklungsdogmatik. Nicht minder aber hat er die schon bei Schleiermacher beobachtete **Tendenz zum Pantheismus verstärkt.** Sagt er doch: „Unser Leben in Gott ist Gottes Leben in uns, nicht im bildlichen, sondern im genauesten Sinn des Wortes," und: „Ohne Welt ist Gott nicht Gott." Die dualistische Anschauung von der Sünde und dementsprechend auch von der Versöhnung als Aufhebung eines wirklichen Gegensatzes hat Hegel auf das stärkste unterminiert. Auf ethisch-sozialem Gebiet sucht er den **Unterschied zwischen Kirche und Staat zu beseitigen** und den letzteren als die höhere und idealere Sozialform erscheinen zu lassen. Unter großen geistesgeschichtlichen Gesichtspunkten beurteilt, kann man sagen: **Eine antik-optimistische wieder modern gemachte Weltanschauung gestaltet bei Hegel die urchristlich-altprotestantische mit ihren dualistisch-pessimistischen Gedankengängen radikal um.** Hegel suchte allerdings selbst den Gegensatz seiner Religionsphilosophie zum Altprotestantismus zu verschleiern. Aber er erklärte doch deutlich, daß jener nur der erste aber noch stark gehemmte Durchbruch des modernen Geistes gewesen sei und das protestantische Prinzip erst von der neuren, besonders seiner Philosophie in voller Reinheit durchgeführt wäre. „Im alten Protestantismus hat sich das subjektive religiöse Prinzip von der Philosophie getrennt und erst in ihr ist es auf wahrhaftige Weise auferstanden." Während die sogenannte Hegelsche Rechte die Gedanken des Meisters mit der überlieferten Tradition auszugleichen suchte, hat die geistes- und theologiegeschichtliche viel bedeutsamer gewordene Hegelsche Linke die tatsächlichen Differenzen zwischen dieser Philosophie und dem geschichtlichen Christentum ans Licht gefördert.

II.

Die Prinzipien Hegels sind in besondrer Klarheit auf die christliche Glaubenslehre von dem persönlich tiefrommen, aber in seiner Theologie durchaus liberalen Schweizer Theologen **A. E. Biedermann** (1819—1885) in der ersten Auflage seiner „Christlichen Dogmatik" (1868) angewandt. Er geht von den kirchlich-biblischen Dogmen aus, sucht aber jedesmal den mythischen Charakter ihrer geschichtlichen Grundlagen und die logischen Widersprüche ihrer Formulierungen, wie etwa bei der Zweinaturenlehre nachzuweisen. Dann aber ist es sein positives Ziel den diesen Dogmen zugrunde liegenden religiösen Inhalt auf haltbare philosophische Formeln zu bringen. „Wissenschaftlich wahr ist ein Glaubensausdruck in dem Grad, als er den Inhalt des christlichen Prinzips auf seinen reinen Gedankenausdruck bringt." Bei der **Gotteslehre** wird die Persönlichkeitsvorstellung abgelehnt und durch den Begriff des absoluten Geistes ersetzt; aus der individuellen **Unsterblichkeit** wird ein ewiges Fortleben im allgemeinen Geist: „Die Annahme eines Fort-

lebens des Menschen über seine individuelle Lebenszeit hinaus ist in Wahrheit religiös indifferent." Besondre Mühe hat Biedermann darauf verwandt zwischen der christlichen **Erlösungsidee,** der Verbindung des Unendlichen mit dem Endlichen, und der geschichtlichen Person Jesu noch einen Zusammenhang zu stiften. In Jesu Persönlichkeit soll dieses Prinzip zum ersten Mal in der Geschichte zur Selbsterkenntnis und damit zur Verwirklichung gekommen sein. Infolgedessen sei Jesus überhaupt „das welthistorisch gewährleistende Vorbild für die Wirksamkeit des Erlösungsprinzipes." Aber wie Biedermann überall die biblisch-kirchlichen Dogmen nicht nur durch andre begriffliche Formulierungen ersetzt, sondern ihres eigenartigen religiösen wie geschichtlichen Inhalts beraubt, so ist auch seine Verbindung zwischen der idealen Erlösungsidee und der geschichtlichen Person Jesu schon eine so lose, daß konsequentes Denken ihre völlige Trennung vornehmen mußte.

III.

Die zerstörende Kraft der Hegelschen Philosophie gegenüber dem geschichtlichen, religiösen, wie metaphysischen Gehalt des Christentums tritt bei **D. Fr. Strauß** (1808—1874) hervor. Seine Bedeutung für die Theologiegeschichte — allerdings wesentlich für die Negationen des Liberalismus innerhalb und außerhalb der Kirche — kann nicht hochgenug eingeschätzt werden. Im Jahre 1835 erschien sein erstes **„Leben Jesu,"** welches ungeheures Aufsehen erregte. Die entscheidende und dauernde Bedeutung des Buches liegt nicht nur in der historisch-kritischen Zersetzung der gesamten überlieferten biblischen Geschichte Jesu, sondern in dem diese leitenden Prinzipien, die ihren Ursprung in der Hegelschen Philosophie haben. Strauß bekennt nämlich in der Einleitung: „Die innere Befreiung des Gemütes und Denkens von gewissen religiösen und dogmatischen Voraussetzungen ist dem Verfasser durch philosophische Studien früh zuteil geworden. Mögen die Theologen diese Voraussetzungslosigkeit seines Werkes unchristlich finden, er findet die gläubigen Voraussetzungen der ihrigen unwissenschaftlich." Strauß macht zwar hier einerseits das dialektische Kunststück, daß er theologischen Voraussetzungen seine angebliche Voraussetzungslosigkeit gegenüberstellt, anderseits aber gesteht er doch offen ein, daß ihn selbst philosophische Voraussetzungen, wenn auch negativer Art entscheidend beeinflussen. Als solche Voraussetzungen nennt Strauß die Ablehnung jedes Supranaturalismus, und die Ueberzeugung, daß auch die biblische Ueberlieferung nur „ein festes Gewebe endlicher Ursachen und Wirkungen" sein könne. **Es handelt sich mithin schon bei Strauß,** wie bei der ihm folgenden liberalen Theologie **nicht um den Gegensatz von Historie und Dogmatik,** wie man es manchmal gern erscheinen lassen wollte, **sondern um den Zusammenstoß von zwei Dogmatiken oder Philosophien, einer christlichen und einer philosophischen.**

Nach Strauß Dogmatik müssen die biblischen Erzählungen den Charakter von Sagen oder **Mythen** tragen. Er definiert Mythen als geschichtsartige Einkleidungen urchristlicher Ideen. Sie sind nach der früheren Aussage von Strauß absichtslos, in der ersten Gemeinde unter dem stärkeren Eindruck der Persönlichkeit Jesu entstanden, nach seiner späteren Behauptung dagegen sind sie absichtsvolle und tendenziöse Bildungen einzelner Männer. Stoff und Form dieser Mythenbildungen läßt Strauß meistens aus dem **Alten Testament,** weniger aus heidnischen Religionen erwachsen. So soll zum Beispiel aus Jes. 7, 14 die Jungfrauengeburt, aus 4. Mose 24, 17, das heißt aus dem Stern Bileams, der Stern von Bethlehem entstanden sein. Die wunderbare Speisung der Witwe von Zarepta soll das Motiv für die wunderbaren Speisungen Jesu abgegeben haben. Selbst einen so menschlichen Vorgang wie der Gebetskampf Jesu in der Gethsemane hält Strauß für erdichtet, da Jesus damals noch nichts von seinem Leiden gewußt haben könnte. Nachdem Strauß durch diese Methode fast alle geschichtlichen Erzählungen des Neuen Testaments, besonders alle Wunder und die Heilstatsachen in Mythen aufgelöst hat, will auch er doch noch zuletzt die ihnen zugrunde liegenden **religionsphilosophischen Ideen** herausarbeiten und an diesen positiv festhalten. Allerdings sieht er die christliche Idee nicht mehr ausschließlich, ja im Grund überhaupt nicht in der geschichtlichen Person Jesu verwirklicht, sondern in der ganzen Menschheit. **Er löst bewußt** — im Unterschied zu Hegel und Biedermann — **die Beziehungen zwischen dem christlichen Prinzip und der Person Jesu.** Er proklamiert geradezu als philosophisches Dogma die antipersonalistische These: „Die Idee liebt es nicht in ein Exemplar ihre ganze Fülle auszuschütten." Daraus ergibt sich ihm als Schluß: „Das ist der Schlüssel der ganzen Christologie, daß als Subjekt der Prädikate, welche die Kirche Christo beilegt, statt eines Individuums eine Idee gesetzt werden muß. In einem Individuum, einem Gottmenschen gedacht, widersprechen sich die Eigenschaften und Funktionen, welche die Kirchenlehre Christo zuschreibt, in der Idee der Gattung stimmen sie zusammen. Die Menschheit ist die Vereinigung der beiden Naturen, der menschgewordene Gott. Sie ist der Sterbende, Auferstehende und gen Himmelfahrende, sofern aus der Negation ihrer Natürlichkeit immer höheres geistiges Leben, aus der Aufhebung ihrer Endlichkeit als persönlichen, nationalen, und weltlichen Geistes ihre Einigkeit mit dem unendlichen Geist des Himmels hervorgeht."

In zwei weiteren Schriften vollzog Strauß die dogmatische und geschichtliche Auflösung des Christentums noch bedeutend radikaler. In dem Buch **„Die christliche Glaubenslehre** in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und im Kampf mit der modernen Wissenschaft dargestellt" (1840) wollte er der Dogmatik das leisten, „was

einem Handelshaus die Bilanz leistet." Diese Bilanz aber ergibt bei ihm eine völlige Unmöglichkeit, das Christentum noch in der modernen Welt zu vertreten. Dieses negative Ergebnis soll die dogmengeschichtliche Entwicklung mit all ihren Widersprüchen unwiderleglich zeigen: „Die wahre Kritik des Dogmas ist seine Geschichte."

In dem Buch **„Das Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk bearbeitet"** (1864) behauptet Strauß, daß man von wenigen Menschen so wenig wisse, wie von dem geschichtlichen Jesus, und das selbst dieses Wenige besonders in ethischer Richtung nicht immer vorbildlich und für uns noch gültig sei. Infolgedessen kann sich der Glaube nicht mehr auf ihn richten, sondern vielmehr auf einen idealen, stetig in der menschlichen Vernunft vorhandenen „Christus," der wesentlich das allgemeine humanistische Menschheitsideal repräsentiert. „Diese Unterscheidung des historischen Christus von dem idealen, das heißt dem in der menschlichen Vernunft liegenden Urbild des Menschen, wie er sein soll, und die Uebertragung des seligmachenden Glaubens von dem ersteren auf das letztere ist das unabweisliche Ergebnis der neueren Geistesentwicklung: **es ist die Fortbildung der Christusreligion zur Humanitätsreligion."** In diesem zweiten Leben Jesu erscheinen die biblischen Ueberlieferungen nicht mehr als unbewußt geschaffene Mythen, sondern als absichtsvolle Dichtungen.

Aber auch bei dieser idealistischen Umdeutung des Christentums bleibt Strauß nicht stehen. In seiner letzten Schrift: **„Der alte und der neue Glaube"** (1872) wirft er die Frage auf: „Sind wir noch Christen?" und beantwortet sie mit Nein, und läßt ihr die weitere folgen: „Haben wir noch Religion?" worauf er die Antwort gibt — Ja und Nein. Er lehnt das Christentum und die Religion darum und soweit ab, wie sie ihm als eine pessimistische und asketische Gedankenwelt erscheint.

Meint er doch auch von der **Reformation,** sie habe noch nicht alle Entfremdung des Geistes aufgehoben: „Die Erde blieb nach wie vor ein Jammertal, aus welchem sich in ein besseres Jenseits hinwegzusehnen, dem wahren Christen nicht unerlaubt, sondern wohlanständig war." — Strauß selbst vertritt in seiner letzten Schrift einen naturwissenschaftlich, darwinistisch begründeten ästhetisch-künstlerisch ausgestalteten Materialismus. Zusammenfassend gilt: **Strauß hat die entscheidenden philosophischen Voraussetzungen einer antisupranaturalistischen und humanistischen Entwicklungsdogmatik geschaffen. Nicht minder hat er die kritischen Methoden und zum großen Teil auch die Ergebnisse des religionsgeschichtlichen Liberalismus geschaffen. Darüber hinausgehend schmiedete er auch die Waffen für einen das Christentum ablehnenden humanistischen**

Idealismus, dann aber auch für einen, jede Religion verwerfenden naturwissenschaftlichen Materialismus. Ihm selbst ist freilich zuletzt das nicht unverdiente tragische Schicksal zuteil geworden, daß ein noch entschiedener Gegner des Christentums, Nietzsche, in einer besondern „Unzeitgemäßen Betrachtung" Strauß als „Bildungsphilister," der eine Religion der Zukunft schaffen wollte, verspottete.

IV.

Die letzte noch mögliche negative Konsequenz in historischer Richtung zog **Bruno Bauer** (1809—1882). Er **löste die Historizität Jesu restlos auf** und erklärte das Christentum für das Geistesprodukt der griechisch-römischen Welt des ausgehenden zweiten Jahrhunderts. „Der christliche Heiland und die Träger des römischen Imperatorentums sind Erzeugnisse derselben Kraft, welche die Ahnungen und immateriellen Güter des Altertums in eine persönliche allmächtige Gestalt zusammenzufassen suchte." — Dieses aus einer antipersonalistischen Welt- und Geschichtsauffassung erwachsene Dogma ist von Zeit zu Zeit immer wieder mit neuen scheinbar geschichtlichen Argumenten belebt, so im 20. Jahrhundert von Arthur Drews in seiner „Christusmythe."

Die letzte negative Konsequenz in metaphysisch-religiöser Richtung zog **L. Feuerbach** (1804—1872) in seinen beiden Werken: „Das Wesen des Christentums" (1841) und „Das Wesen der Religion" (1845). Auch er beginnt bei Hegel, wendet sich aber allmählich vom Idealismus ab und dem Materialismus zu, wie Strauß. Feuerbach bezeichnet es als seine Grundabsicht: „Die Menschen aus Theologen zu Anthropologen, aus Theophilen zu Philanthropen, aus Kandidaten des Jenseits zu Studenten des Diesseits zu machen." Er suchte und fand das Geheimnis der Theologie in der Anthropologie. Die Götter sind nur ins Transzendente erhobene praktische, — unerfüllbare oder erfüllte — menschliche Herzenswünsche. „Der Wunsch ist der Ursprung, ist das Wesen selbst der Religion, das Wesen der Götter nichts anders als das Wesen des Wunsches. Wie die Wünsche der Menschen so sind ihre Götter." — „Die Religion, wenigstens die christliche ist das Verhalten der Menschen zu sich selbst oder richtiger zu seinem Wesen als einem andern Wesen." Ebenso steht es mit dem Jenseits: „So ist das Jenseits nichts anders als das Diesseits, befreit von dem was als Schranke, was als Uebel erscheint." **Sind Gotteserkenntnis wie Jenseitsglaube nur menschliche Wunschgebilde, so ist Religion und Christentum — „Illusion."** Nach Feuerbach handelt es sich aber nicht einmal um eine wohltätige Illusion, sondern um eine grundverderbliche, weil die Religion den Menschen „um die Kraft des wirklichen Lebens und um den Wahrheits- und Tugendsinn bringt." Nach dieser Methode erklärt und kritisiert Feuerbach alle einzelnen Vorstellungen des Chri-

stentums. Sein Radikalismus geht weit über alle liberale innertheologische Kritik hinaus und wird zu dem charakteristischen Grundgedanken eines in antireligiösen Kreisen weitverbreiteten Dogmas, welches **in der Religion eine theoretische Illusion und eine praktische Schädigung der innerweltlichen sittlichen Aktivität sieht.**

V.

Innerhalb der Theologie und zwar der altliberalen hielt sich die außerordentliche umfangreiche Lebensarbeit des großen Kritikers **F. Chr. Baur** in Tübingen (1792—1862), dem sich eine weitverbreitete Schule anschloß. Sein eigentliches Arbeitsgebiet war zwar das Neue Testament und die Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte, aus deren sich aber bedeutende Konsequenzen für die gesamte Theologie ergaben. Auch Baur erklärte: „Ohne Philosophie ist mir die Geschichte stumm," und leugnete prinzipiell jedes Wunder, weil es den natürlichen Zusammenhang der Geschichte aufhebt. Trotzdem wollte er nach rein exakt-historischer Methode neutestamentliche Quellenkritik treiben. Ihr Ergebnis war nur die Echtheit von vier Paulinen (Römer, Galater, 1. und 2. Korinther Brief) und dann der judäistischen Apokalypse. Auf Grund der Quellen, aber nach Hegelschen Prinzipien zeichnete er die Geschichte des apostolischen Zeitalters als eines bewußten Kampfes zwischen einem streng partikularistischen Judaismus und einem heiden-christlichen Universalismus. Die „Tendenzen" des ersteren vertritt das Buch des Matthäus, des letzteren Lukas, während Markus beide neutralisiert. Aus dieser Synthese erwuchs die Katholische Kirche; auch die ganze weitere Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte konstruierte Baur entwicklungsgeschichtlich nach Hegelschen Prinzipien. Auf den Katholizismus folgt als Gegenschlag wie als höhere Stufe der Altprotestantismus, der aber seinerseits wieder durch den seit dem 18. Jahrhundert sich bildenden Neuprotestantismus abgelöst wird. Dieser erst kritisiert mit Recht das von der Reformation noch stehen gelassene altkirchliche Dogma. Positiv ist der Neuprotestantismus: „Humanisierung, Rationalisierung, Subjektivierung, Verinnerlichung, Vergeistigung des Christentums." In dieser Richtung soll die gegenwärtige Theologie die christlichen Dogmen umgestalten, wie das Baur selbst in einer eingehenden Monographie gegenüber dem Dreieinigkeitsglauben unternommen hat. Mit dieser Arbeit wird allerdings die Theologie niemals fertig werden und soll es auch nicht, denn der Protestantismus ist „ein einer unendlichen Entwicklung fähiges Prinzip." **So hat Baur nicht nur das Hegelsche Prinzip konsequent auf die gesamte Geschichte des Christentums angewandt, sondern auch die Prinzipien und Ziele der altliberalen Theologie klar zum Ausdruck gebracht.**

VI.

Der Heidelberger Theologe **R. Rothe** (1799—1867) steht sowohl unter den Einflüssen Schleiermachers wie Hegels, hat aber aus den verschiedenen Anregungen eines der originalsten und geistvollsten Systeme der neueren Theologiegeschichte geschaffen. In ihm finden sich gewiß starke Beziehungen zum Altprotestantismus, in seiner Lehre von Wunder, Offenbarung, Inspiration vor allem aber grundlegende Thesen des älteren und neueren Liberalismus. Nur die letzteren haben eine größere theologiegeschichtliche Wirkung gehabt, vor allem durch Troeltsch, und sind darum allein an dieser Stelle zu reproduzieren. In seiner „Theologische Ethik" (1. Auflage 1845 ff.) entwarf Rothe ein ganzes **philosophisch-theologisches System mit besondrer Abzweckung auf die Sittlichkeit.** Er nahm einmal eine Entwicklung schon in Gott und von Gott abwärts zur Welt und dann wieder von der Welt zu Gott aufwärts an. Er kombinierte theistische, pantheistische, neuplatonische, ja gnostische Elemente miteinander. Nachdem er das Wesen Gottes spekulativ entwickelt hat, schildert er die von Gott geschaffene Natur. Innerhalb dieser beginnt mit der menschlichen Persönlichkeit und ihrer Freiheit eine ganz neue Stufe. Der Mensch hat die sittliche Aufgabe, sich die materielle Natur anzueignen, und dadurch einen vergeistigten Naturorganismus zu schaffen. Erst mit seinem Besitz wird der Mensch zum Ebenbild Gottes, sodaß der sittliche Prozeß auch zugleich ein religiöser ist. Der Vergeistigungsprozeß der Natur verläuft allerdings abnormal, da die sinnliche Natur das Uebergewicht über den Geist hat. Dieser Tatbestand macht das Wesen der Sünde aus. Infolgedessen vollzieht Gott in Christus eine Erlösung. Sie besteht darin, daß Gott in Christus einen „zweiten Adam" in die Geschichte eintreten läßt. „Der zweite Adam tritt auf übernatürliche Weise ins Leben, aber aus der natürlichen Menschheit hervor. Er wird der neuen, durch ihn aus der Materie in den Geist umgeborenen, Menschheit der prinzipielle Lebensmittelpunkt, das Haupt, das Zentralindividuum einer neuen geistigen Menschheit." **Zunächst in Christus und dann durch ihn in der Welt erfolgt die schöpferische Umbildung der Natur durch den Geist.**

Für Rothe ist Zweck und Ziel der göttlichen Schöpfung wie der christlichen Neuschöpfung die Ineinsbildung von Natur und Geist oder die **Herstellung von sittlicher Kultur.** In ihr hat auch die Religion ihren höchsten Zweck. Die spezielle Bedeutung des Christentums besteht darin, daß es die Hemmungen der Sünde überwindet und die Erreichung des kulturellen Endzieles ermöglicht. Dementsprechend ist auch die **Kirche** das heißt die soziale Schöpfung des Christentums nur eine vorläufige Erscheinung und ein Mittel zu dem Zweck, eine allgemein menschliche soziale Kultur-

gemeinschaft hervorzurufen. Diese ist der Staat. „An der Gemeinschaft der Erlösung tritt ursprünglich bestimmt die religiöse Seite hervor. Das Reich Gottes bildet sich also geschichtlich primitiv als die christliche Kirche. Wiewohl die christliche Gemeinschaft nicht als Staat anheben kann, sondern nur als Kirche, so ist doch das notwendige Resultat ihrer eigenen Lebensentwicklung die allmähliche Aufhebung ihrer kirchlichen Form durch die Umbildung derselben in die staatliche." **Das Christentum soll sich darum immer vollständiger verweltlichen, das heißt seine kirchliche Formablegen, um in die des Staates überzugehen,** der die Totalität der sittlichen Zwecke umfaßt. — In dieser Richtung bedeutet die Reformation einen Fortschritt. Aber nach Rothe ist gerade das altprotestantische Luthertum durch seinen exklusiven Supranaturalismus und sein Festhalten an dem Kirchenbegriff noch stark katholisch. Die kulturelle Humanisierung kommt viel deutlicher in der Renaissance zum Ausdruck, der die reformierte Konfession und noch mehr die Sekten sich stärker geöffnet haben als das Luthertum. „Die aus der Reformation unmittelbar hervorgegangene Herstellung des Christentums und der christlichen Welt ist noch nicht die wahrhaft protestantische; noch nicht diejenige, welche in dem protestantisch-christlichen Prinzip als definitiver Zweck liegt." Erst das moderne Geistesleben hat das reformatorische Prinzip von den katholischen Zügen des Altprotestantismus befreit. Durch die Verbindung mit diesem Geistesleben entsteht der **Neuprotestantismus,** der nicht mehr auf die Erhaltung der Kirche ausgeht, sondern außerhalb ihrer viel „unbewußtes Christentum" anerkennt. **Sein Ziel ist ein umfassender Kulturprotestantismus als innerste sittlichreligiöse Kraft der staatlichen Menschengemeinschaft.**

Rothe gestaltet die ältere liberale Theologie zu einem umfassenden neuprotestantischen Programm um. Er streift alle transzendenten, supranaturalen, asketischen Elemente von Urchristentum und Altprotestantismus ab und erstrebt statt dessen eine volle Identifizierung von Kultur und Religion, von Staat und Kirche. Diese Tendenzen haben auch nach dem Zusammenbruch der älteren liberalen Theologie ihre Lebenskraft bewahrt und sind Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts in der religionsgeschichtlichen Theologie wieder wirksam geworden.

Der alte und der neue Glaube.

Von Pastor H. Niedernhoefer.

Allgemeines.

Es soll diese Arbeit keine strikt wissenschaftliche, theologische sein, sondern nur ein Versuch uns auf diesem weiten Gebiet womöglich etwas Klarheit zu verschaffen. Für den christlichen Glauben muß es eine Quelle geben. Diese Quelle ist nicht für alle christlichen Denominationen ein und dieselbe. Wohl sagt man im allgemeinen, daß die Bibel diese Quelle sei, aber es kann nicht geleugnet werden, daß sowohl Tradition als auch die Lehren der respektiven Denominationen in gar vielen Fällen höher geachtet werden als die Bibel selbst. Alle aber berufen sich auch in diesen Fällen wiederum auf die Bibel als die Quelle, aus der sie geschöpft. Wir müssen darum eine klare, bestimmte Auffassung von der Bibel haben, um auch eine bestimmte Stellung einnehmen zu können. Es genügt ja nicht für uns Prediger zu sagen: die ganze Bibel ist Gottes Wort, und an diesem Ausspruch läßt sich eben nicht drehen und deuteln. Das bekennt man allerwärts in der ganzen Christenheit, und doch sind die Bekenner keineswegs einig in ihrer Auffassung, Auslegung und Anwendung derselben im Alltagsleben, ja es scheint, daß gerade die Bibel die Ursache in allen Fällen war, daß man sich trennte, und daß sie auch den alten und den neuen Glauben verursachte. Wie kommt das? Die Abfassung der Bibel umschließt eben eine sehr lange Zeit, und der Verfasser sind viele. Auch kann nicht geleugnet werden, daß dieselben verschiedene Charaktereigenschaften offenbaren. Als Verfasser müssen wir erkennen Priester, die auf strikte Ordnung dringen, Schriftgelehrte, die beweisen wollen, Historiker, die die Geschichte nach ihrer Art beschreiben, Theologen, die in die göttlichen Geheimnisse einzudringen suchen und Propheten, die in der Gemeinschaft mit Gott Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunft aufs innigste verbinden und Gottes ewige Pläne der Menschheit mitteilen. Unter diesen Verfassern finden wir dann solche, die zäh am alten kleben und andre, die wir als Idealisten und Reformer bezeichnen müssen. Ja die Verfasser offenbaren:

„Alt ist, wer am Alten bangend klebt, Nicht wagt, aus Altem Neues frei zu formen. Jung (neu) ist, wer nach neuem mutig strebt, mit Freuden lernt, aus Altem Besseres zu formen.“ Wer könnte leugnen, daß gerade die Propheten vor allen andern zu dieser Klasse gehören. Von den Propheten heißt es darum auch, „sie haben geredet, getrieben durch den Heiligen Geist.“ Man muß aber nun nicht denken, daß es sehr leicht sei festzustellen, zu welcher Klasse der eine oder der andre der Schreiber gehört. Man wird

finden, daß ein und derselbe Verfasser mehrere Eigenschaften vertritt, aber gewiß ist dann, daß eine besondre Eigenschaft in ganz besondrer Weise hervortritt. Und finden wir diese Tatsache nicht auch noch heute bestätigt? Darum ist es so schwer, mit Bibelstellen diese oder jene Ansicht zu begründen, oder diese oder jene Ansicht, oder Lehre zu beweisen. Es ist eben eine Tatsache, daß man mit der Bibel gar oft gerade das Gegenteil von einer Behauptung eines andern, aufzustellen vermag. Und das ist nicht zu bedauern, es ist gut so, „auf daß sich kein Fleisch vor ihm rühme." Die Bibel ist eben zu reichhaltig, als daß nur einer, oder einige sie völlig erfassen könnten. Sehen wir nun nach

Der Entstehung der Bibel.

Ist die Bibel wirklich inspiriert? Ist überhaupt eine Inspiration denkbar und möglich? Erklären wir die Bibel als **Gottes Wort,** dann bekennen wir damit auch, daß die Bibel inspiriert sein muß, und dieses wieder schließt in sich einen lebendigen Gott, einen Gott, der nicht nur das All geschaffen hat, sondern auch einen bestimmten Plan mit seiner Schöpfung haben muß und darum auch Wege und Mittel besitzen muß, diesen seinen Plan seinen Geschöpfen und zwar den Menschen mitteilen zu können. Nun sagt aber Jesus von Gott Joh. 5, 37: „Ihr habt nie seine Stimme gehöret, noch seine Gestalt gesehen." Wenn das aber der Fall ist und auch sonst noch reichlich durch die Schrift bezeugt wird, wie hat sich dann Gott geoffenbart? Wollte man aber eine Offenbarung nicht annehmen, dann müßte streng genommen man auch die Möglichkeit einer Entwicklung verwerfen. Es müßte dann im Fall der Menschheit der erste Mensch der vollkommenste gewesen sein, mit aller Weisheit begabt, mit allen Kräften ausgerüstet, so daß kein späterer Mensch ihn in irgendeiner Weise übertreffen könnte.

Dies aber ist nicht der Fall. Die Schüler übertreffen die Lehrer, und dies ist darum der beste Beweis göttlicher Offenbarung, oder der Inspiration. Darum sagt die Schrift so schön und wahr Hebr. 1, 1. 2: „Nachdem vor Zeiten Gott manchesmal und auf mancherlei Weise zu den Vätern geredet hat durch die Propheten, hat er am letzten in diesen Tagen zu uns geredet durch seinen Sohn." Und wie hat er zu uns geredet, wenn doch niemand je seine Stimme gehöret hat? Durch die Propheten und seinen Sohn. Hat Gott diese Propheten sich ohne den Willen derselben auserlesen und sie gleichsam auf die Knie gezwungen und ihnen diktiert, was sie reden und was sie schreiben sollten? Wenn man manche Ausleger älterer und auch neuerer Zeit ernst nehmen müßte, blieb keine andre Auswahl übrig. Das aber widerspricht aller Vernunft und Wahrheit.

2. Petri 1, 21 lesen wir: „Denn es ist noch nie eine Weis-

sagung aus menschlichem Willen hervorgebracht, sondern die heiligen Menschen Gottes haben geredet, getrieben von dem Heiligen Geist." Es waren also besondre Menschen und diese Menschen werden „Heilige" genannt. „Suchet so werdet ihr finden" und „dem Aufrichtigen läßt es Gott gelingen." Doch auch dieses Suchen hat seine Bedingungen. Paulus macht das klar in Römer 1, 19. 20: „Denn daß man weiß, daß Gott sei, ist ihnen offenbar, denn Gott hat es ihnen offenbaret, damit, daß Gottes unsichtbares Wesen, das ist seine ewige Kraft und Gottheit wird ersehen, so man das wahrnimmt an seinen Werken, nämlich der Schöpfung der Welt, also, daß sie keine Entschuldigung haben."

Dies aber fordert Arbeit, Suchen, Forschen und Denken und nur wer dazu Freudigkeit hat und aus der Wahrheit ist, empfängt göttliche Offenbarungen, wird inspiriert. Und nur auf solche Weise wird der Mensch der Herr der Schöpfung nach 1. Mose 1, 28. Solche Inspirationen hören nie auf, sie sind auch heute noch eine Tatsache und ebenso wahr, wie vor alter Zeit. In der lebendigen Gemeinschaft mit Gott liegt die Bedingung der göttlichen Offenbarung. Aber

Welchen Zweck hat denn die Offenbarung?

Sie ist gewiß nicht um Gottes willen, damit Gott in die rechte, ihm gebührende Stellung im gesamten Universum gesetzt würde. Gott bedarf für sich keines Geschöpfes, „er ist sich selbst genug." Sie geschieht um unsertwillen. Sein Wesen soll und muß in unserm Leben einen Widerklang finden. Wir müssen ihm gleich werden, oder „vollkommen sein, wie unser Vater im Himmel vollkommen ist." Der ganze und der alleinige Zweck der Inspiration ist die allmähliche Entwicklung und endliche Vollendung aller Dinge, „auf daß Gott sei alles in allem." Die Erkenntnis dieser Inspiration ist wie die Inspiration selbst keineswegs von Anfang an klar erkannt und zum Ausdruck gebracht worden, auch sie wuchs zur größerer Vollkommenheit, wie die Schöpfung und die Erkenntnis der Schöpfung sowie die Gesetze derselben, oder der Natur selbst. Die Zentrale aller Offenbarung ist Jesus, in welchem „alle Fülle der Gottheit leibhaftig wohnt." Es kann darum auch niemand und nichts zur Vollkommenheit ohne Jesum gelangen. Wenn wir aber nun sagen, daß Jesus die Zentrale aller Offenbarung ist, dann bekennen wir auch damit, daß es in der Offenbarung Unterschiede geben muß.

Das heißt nicht alles, was in der Bibel steht, ist von gleichem belanglos sind. Man macht also einen Unterschied, man wählt. Wert und hat gleiche Bedeutung. Ja es gibt Abschnitte, die ganz persönlicher Art sind, andre wieder, die nur lokale und zeitliche Bedeutung haben und darum für andre Völker und andre Zeiten

Darum hat man gesagt: Nicht die Bibel als solche ist Gottes Wort, sondern Gottes Wort finden wir in der Bibel. Diese Tatsache war dann wohl die Ursache, und es scheint sie ist es noch bis heute, daß man sich nicht einigen konnte, ja daß man schon gar oft mit der Bibel in der Hand die allergrößten Ungerechtigkeiten, ja Schändlichkeiten zu verteidigen suchte. Und so wurde dann die Bibel in solchen Fällen nicht die Quelle des Lebens und Segens, sondern sie wurde ein Götze und Tyrann, unter dem große Teile der Menschheit schwer leiden mußten. Und damit komen wir nun zur eigentlichen Behandlung unsers Themas. Denn es wäre gar nicht zu verwundern, wenn das bisher gesagte nicht schon in dem Herzen des einen oder andern einen Widerspruch angeregt hätte. Denn eben die persönliche Stellung solchen Fragen gegenüber zeitigt, wie man sich nun einmal so auszudrücken gewöhnt ist, den alten und den neuen Glauben. In unsrer Zeit redet man aber lieber von: Fundamentalismus und Modernismus. — Es handelt sich in unsrer Zeit hauptsächlich um drei Streitfragen: 1. Inspiration, 2. Jesus Christus, a. göttliche Zeugung. b. Erlösung, 3. Wiederkunft Christi und Gericht.

1. Inspiration.

Die Anhänger und Verteidiger des alten Glaubens sagen: Die Bibel ist Gottes Wort und sie fordern, daß ein jeder Christ solches bekennen sollte und auch dabei bleiben. Solche aber finden wir nicht in einer besondern, von allen andern Kirchengemeinschaften abgesonderten Gemeinschaft, sondern wir finden solche Anhänger in allen Denominationen. Dieser Fundamentalglaube aber hat die Anhänger desselben keineswegs miteinander so innig verbunden, daß sie auf Grund der Heiligen Schrift ein völlig einheitliches Bekenntnis gefunden hätten. Und fragen wir nun, warum ist das noch nicht geschehen, so werden wir wohl kaum zu einem andern Schluß kommen können, als daß ihr Bekenntnis nicht in allem der Wahrheit entspricht. Die Anhänger des alten Glaubens sind sehr individueller Art. Sie sind nicht einmal in einer und derselben Gemeinschaft imstande, eine geschlossene Einheit zu bilden. Bei genauerer Prüfung werden wir finden müssen, daß es fast in jedem einzelnen Fall immer wieder besondre Stellen der Schrift sind, die man lieber hat als andre und auf Grund derselben sich eine Anschauung geschaffen hat, die mit andern nicht ganz in Einklang gebracht werden kann. Dies ist ganz natürlicher Weise besonders der Fall bei besonders begabten Persönlichkeiten, und da dieselben imstande sind, ihre Ansichten genau zu definieren und aufs beste zu verteidigen, so folgt daraus abermals, daß neue Gemeinschaften gegründet wurden. Aber etwas anders wurde damit noch nicht geoffenbart: sie alle beweisen, ob sie es wollen oder nicht, daß nicht die ganze Bibel das geoffenbarte Gotteswort ist, sondern genau

genommen nur das, was ihnen persönlich am besten in ihr System paßt. Wann hat diese Art der Arbeit begonnen? Wir können getrost sagen: Sie begann mit der Formulierung des religiösen Glaubens und Lebens. Davon zeugt die Bibel selbst.

Warum die Kämpfe der Propheten? Warum ihre Leiden? Wer waren in diesen Fällen die Anhänger des alten und wer die Anhänger des neuen Glaubens? Man denke an Christus! Wurde er nicht beschuldigt, die Sitten und Gebräuche, Gesetz und Propheten aufzulösen und das Volk zu verführen? Und wer beschuldigte ihn? Waren es wohl die Anhänger des neuen oder des alten Glaubens? Und was taten die ersten Christen auf jener ersten Kirchenkonferenz zu Jerusalem? Sie erklärten ein von Gott verordnetes, für das Volk Gottes für alle Zeiten geltendes Institut, nämlich die Beschneidung, als „ein Joch auf der Jünger Hälse," Acta 15. Und dasselbe geschah gegnüber dem Sabbath, der doch ein Zeichen zwischen Gott und den Menschen für alle Zeiten sein sollte. Und folgen wir dann weiter dem Entwicklungslauf der Kirche. Wir wollen nur einiges hervorheben.

Hat nicht Dr. Martin Luther das von ihm nach seinem eigenen Bedürfnis und nach seiner Erkenntnis gefundene Evangelium höher als alles andre geachtet und darum auch alles, was dem zu widersprechen schien, kurzerhand als völlig gleichgültig bezeichnet, ja sogar von „der strohenen Epistel des Jakobus geredet und geschrieben?" War er ein Verteidiger des alten oder des neuen Glaubens? Es ist ferner eine Tatsache, daß, mit nur ganz wenigen Ausnahmen, die gesamte Christenheit den Schöpfungsbericht, in bezug auf die Schöpfungs**tage,** nicht mehr wörtlich versteht, auch hat sich die Kirche, ohne Schaden zu nehmen, ganz ruhig darein gefunden, daß die Erde sich um die Sonne und nicht die Sonne um die Erde dreht. Es gab aber eine Zeit, da eine solche Lehre als fundamental angesehen und verfochten wurde und man fürchtete, daß durch Verleugnung dieses Glaubens die ganze christliche Religion sicherlich dem Verfall entgegen gehen würde. Was ist also der alte Glaube in bezug auf die Inspiration? Fragen wir, um nur einige Kirchenkörper zu nennen, die Katholiken, die Lutheraner, die Reformierten, die Baptisten, die Methodisten, also alles anerkannte bedeutende Kirchenkörper. Fragen wir ferner die sogenannten Sekten und welche Antworten werden wir bekommen? Was ist Gottes Wort? Welche Teile der Schrift sind über alle Zweifel erhaben wirklich Gottes Wort? Wer hat das Recht solches zu bestimmen? Welche Teile sind die bedeutendsten, welche von besondrer Wichtigkeit? Welche Teile müssen wörtlich, welche symbolisch und welche geistig verstanden werden? Die des neuen Glaubens, die Modernen, gestehen ganz offen: Angesichts aller dieser Tatsachen kann keine Kirche für irgendein Glied zu irgendeiner Zeit eine feststehende, über

alle Zweifel erhabene und darum für alle bindende Regel und Gebot aufstellen. Es muß dem Gewissen und der Erkenntnis des Einzelnen die Freiheit des persönlichen Urteils zugestanden werden. „Ein jeglicher sei seiner Meinung gewiß."

Daß auch die Anhänger des neuen Glaubens ebensowenig eine Einheit bilden, wie die des alten, ist ebenfalls bekannt und auch gar nicht zu verwundern. Es ist ferner gewiß, daß eine große Anzahl derer, die mehr dem alten Glauben zugeneigt sind, ohne Gewissensbedenken gar vieles aus dem neuen Glauben sich aneignen könnten, wie auch umgekehrt viele Anhänger des neuen Glaubens doch noch unentwegt am wahren guten alten Glauben festhalten. Es blieben dann nur auf beiden Seiten die äußersten Extreme. Und die hat es immer gegeben. Aber ist denn alles nun so verschwommen, gibt es denn gar keine Gewißheit? Die Gewißheit muß in der **Wirkung** der Inspiration, oder sagen wir in der Kraft des Wortes Gottes im persönlichen Leben des Einzelnen gesucht werden. Nur dann, wenn uns das Wort Gottes, welche Stelle es auch sein mag, in die innigste Gemeinschaft mit Gott selbst durch Christum gebracht hat, so daß wir sagen können: „Ich lebe, aber nicht ich, sondern Christus lebet in mir," nur dann hat die Schrift für mich oder den Leser ihren Zweck erreicht, nur dann erfahren wir, was die Kraft und Herrlichkeit des Wortes Gottes ist. „Der Buchstabe tötet, der Geist aber macht lebendig." Unter solcher Zucht des Geistes wird die Bibel nicht veralten, nicht aufhören, das bedeutendste Buch, das Buch aller Bücher zu sein. Es wird unaufhörlich die reichste Quelle für alle Erkenntnis bilden, aber auch die Kraft offenbaren, alle Dinge neu zugestalten. Und das allein ist der Zweck der Inspiration.

2. Jesus Christus.

Wohl keine andre Frage greift tiefer in das Leben der Menschen und vor allem in das Leben der christlichen Kirche hinein als die Frage: Was dünkt dich um Jesus, weß Sohn ist er? Mit ihm steht und fällt das Christentum. Tatsache ist aber nun, daß alle Kirchen, ja auch alle sogenannten Sekten Jesum anerkennen und zu aller Zeit anerkannt haben. Und nicht allein die Kirchen und Sekten, sondern auch sogenannte religionslose Vereinigungen und selbst viele Heiden erkennen die Größe und Bedeutung Jesu willig an und zollen ihm große Ehre. Wenn das aber der Fall ist, warum streiten sich dann die Menschen und besonders die Anhänger des alten und des neuen Glaubens in betreff seiner Person? Warum verwirft man andre Bekenner als Nichtchristen, da sie doch Jesum ehren? Die Kirche bekennt eben: „Jesus Christus ist wahrer Gott und wahrer Mensch in einer Person." Und die Verteidiger des alten Glaubens sagen, dieser Spruch kann und darf niemals ge-

ändert werden. Ein jeder Versuch an der Richtigkeit dieses Spruches auch nur im geringsten zu zweifeln, löst die Gemeinschaft mit der Kirche und untergräbt die Autorität Jesu. Das führt uns zu

a. der göttlichen Zeugung Jesu.

Um diese zu beweisen, beruft man sich natürlicherweise auf die Bibel. Als besondre Schriftstellen führt man an: Matth. 1, 18—25; Lukas 1, 26—38; Joh. 1, 1—5. Und außer diesen Stellen gibt es noch eine Unmenge andrer Stellen der Schrift, die ebenfalls als Beweis angeführt werden können. Es wird ferner darauf hingewiesen, daß nur der reine, sündlose Gottessohn, der von keiner Erbsünde, noch persönlicher Sünde, etwas wußte, Gott auf Erden vertreten und das Lamm Gottes, welches der Welt Sünde trägt, sein konnte. Nur Jesus Christus, wahrer Gott und wahrer Mensch, paßt in das christliche Religionssystem. Alles dies aber konnte in Jesus nur zutreffen, wenn er nicht auf dem natürlichen Weg der Zeugung durch einen Mann, sondern durch Gott selbst gezeugt wurde. Jesus muß eine Neuschöpfung sein. Alle weiteren Schlußfolgerungen sind uns ja gut bekannt, darum wollen wir uns nicht länger dabei aufhalten. Mit diesem Bekenntnis sind aber die Verteidiger des neuen Glaubens nicht in voller Harmonie. Einige weichen nur in wenigem, andre in mehr Punkten von obigem ab. Was sind deren Gründe? Bedienen sie sich nur der Vernunft, oder gebrauchen sie auch die Bibel als Beweis für ihre Stellung? Sie gebrauchen beides. Sie gehen von dem biblischen Begriff der **Gotteserkenntnis** aus und dabei berufen sie sich auf das alte wie auch auf das neue Testament. „Höre, Israel, der Herr unser Gott ist ein einiger Gott," „von ihm, durch ihn und zu ihm sind alle Dinge." Sie gebrauchen vor allem das Wort aus dem Mund Jesu selbst, Joh. 17, 3: „Das ist aber das ewige Leben, daß sie dich, daß du **allein** wahrer Gott bist und den du gesandt hast, Jesum Christum, erkennen. Sie berufen sich ferner auf viele Verheißungen im alten Testament, in welchen von dem Messias, Christus, gezeugt wird. Er wird „Abrahams Same" genannt, von ihm zeugt Moses im 5. Buch 18, 15: „Einen Propheten, wie mich, wird der Herr, dein Gott, dir erwecken, aus deinen Brüdern, dem sollt ihr gehorchen." Sie rufen den Psalmisten zum Zeugen auf Psalm 2, 7: „Du bist mein Sohn, **heute** habe ich dich gezeuget." Sie berufen sich ferner auf Jesus selbst, welcher fortwährend seine Abhängigkeit von dem Vater bezeugte. Alles, was er besaß, war eine Gabe von seinem Vater, alles, was er tat, war seines Vaters Werk und geschah durch des Vaters Macht. Das alles, sagen sie, ist doch genügender Beweis, daß Jesus wohl Gottes Sohn ist, der einzigartige, der, in dem alle Fülle der Gottheit leibhaftig wohnet, dem alle Gewalt gegeben ist, im Himmel,

wie auf Erden, aber damit nicht auch zugleich **wahrer Gott** von Ewigkeit zu Ewigkeit. Das kann allein nur Gott selbst sein. Sie sagen ferner, daß das das übereinstimende Zeugnis auch der Jünger ist und der Bibelstellen gebrauchen sie viele und um dem ganzen die Krone aufzusetzen, berufen sie sich auf 1. Kor. 15, 28, da Paulus bezeugt, daß nachdem alles untertan geworden ist, auch Jesus selbst untertan sein wird. Sie gebrauchen auch die Vernunft, behaupten aber, daß sie bei dem Gebrauch auch wieder der Schrift Gehorsam leisten. Sie verwerfen die Idee der unbefleckten Empfängnis. Dabei berufen sie sich zuerst auf 1. Mose 1. 28 und sagen, keine Empfängnis ist an und für sich eine befleckte, sondern ein Akt des Gehorsams des göttlichen Gebotes. Sie sagen weiter, daß alles Entstehen des Lebens ein Werk Gottes sei und durch Luther schon so anerkannt und ausgesprochen wurde: „Ich glaube, daß Gott mich geschaffen hat samt aller Kreatur," und dies wird in der Bibel in besondern Fällen ausdrücklich hervorgehoben. Man denke vor allem nur an Sarah im Alten und an Elisabeth im Neuen Testament. Sie wurden beide Mütter von Kindern der Verheißung ganz gegen die allgemeinen Gesetze der Natur. Ja die ganze Erzählung der Verheißung und der Geburt des Johannes ähnelt in auffälliger Weise der des Herrn Jesu. Bei Jesus aber macht man die Jungfrauschaft geltend. Es kann nun aber auf die katholische Kirche hingewiesen werden, welche auch eine unbefleckte Empfängnis bei Maria annimmt. Wo wäre nun der Anfang, wo das Ende? Sie gehen noch einen Schritt weiter und fragen: Welcher Akt bei der Empfängnis ist der sündliche, nur der des Mannes oder auch der des Weibes? Sagt nicht die Schrift, daß durch das Weib die Uebertretung in die Welt gekommen ist? 1. Tim. 2, 14. Auch wird Joseph von Maria selbst mehreremal der Vater Jesu genannt. Es bliebe dann eigentlich nur die Stelle in Matthäus zur Beweiskraft für die jungfräuliche Geburt Jesu übrig. So stehen denn auch in dieser Frage die Anhänger beider Teile einander gegenüber, und ein jeder Teil kämpft mit der Bibel in der Hand. Wer kann nun recht haben? Wird diese Frage überhaupt von einem Menschen je klar und über alle Zweifel beantwortet werden können? Und wem steht das Recht zu den Bruder zu verdammen? Ist die ganze Frage eine solche die verstanden oder nur geglaubt werden muß? Wenn letzteres der Fall ist, muß man dann nicht an die Worte Pauli sich erinnern, der doch so sehr auf den Glauben pocht: „Und wenn ich **allen** Glauben hätte . . . . und hätte der Liebe nicht, so wäre es mir nichts nütze?" Ist nicht ein **Leben** erfüllt von dem Geist Christi, willig zum freudigen Dienst an den Brüdern von größerm Wert als ein rechthaberischer Streit, der wohl kaum je zur vollen Zufriedenheit gelöst werden kann? Darum „richtet nicht, auf daß ihr nicht gerichtet werdet."

Aufs engste mit dieser ersten Frage ist die zweite unter dieser Rubrik verbunden.

b. Die Erlösung durch Christus.

Auch inbezug auf diese Frage geht man weit auseinander. Der a. G. sagt, der Mensch als solcher ist völlig unter der Macht der Sünde und darum verloren. Er kann sich nimmer selbst erlösen. Ueber ihm waltet ein ewiger Fluch. Er kann weiter nichts tun zu seiner Erlösung als dieselbe als ein Gnadengeschenk Gottes nur annehmen. Gott muß nach seiner ewigen Gerechtigkeit den Sünder verdammen und von dieser Verdammnis kann der Mensch nur durch den Opfertod Jesu, als das Lamm Gottes, erlöst werden. Zur Bestättigung dieser Behauptung oder Lehre beruft man sich auf das Vorbild in der Opferung des Isaak, auf die Erhöhung der ehernen Schlange in der Wüste, auf die gesamte Einrichtung des Opferdienstes im Alten Testament, auf die Zeugnisse der Propheten, vor allem Jes. 53, und auf die Zeugnisse Jesu und der Apostel. Und diese Zeugnisse sind so reichhaltig, scheinbar so über alle Zweifel erhaben, daß man kaum begreifen kann, wie ein Mensch noch andrer Meinung sein kann, oder gar noch gegenteilige Beweise aus der Bibel erbringen könnte.

Aber trotz aller dieser Beweise hat man doch schon in früheren Zeiten und noch mehr in unsrer Zeit an der Richtigkeit der Beweise und der Schlußfolgerungen gezweifelt. Wie für so viele andre Erscheinungen im religiösen Leben der Christen hat auch hierzu wieder die Bibel die Veranlassung gegeben. Der Mensch kann eben nicht für alle Zeiten und unter allen Umständen auf nur blinden, gehorsamen Glauben seine religiöse Ueberzeugung aufbauen. Der denkende Mensch fordert Gründe für seinen Glauben, er fordert Erkenntnis. Die Bibel ist aber nicht nur für einige wenige ein offenes Buch, sie ist ein Buch für alle und der Herr fordert: „Suchet in der Schrift." Wäre aber alles in der Bibel einfach und verständlich, dann brauchte man weder zu suchen noch alles zu prüfen. Auch bezeugt die Bibel, daß Gott der Gott aller ist, der Juden und Heiden und in unsrer Zeit, der Fundamentalisten und der Modernen. Die Bibel wird nicht aufhören Wunder zu wirken, auch Wunder der Erkenntnis. Auch ist nicht zu vergessen, daß wir noch immer durch einen Spiegel sehen, daß noch nicht erschienen ist, was wir sein werden, daß unser Glaube immer noch Stückwerk ist. Und was für neue Anschauungen haben nun die Anhänger des neuen Glaubens? Sie gehen von inneren Gründen, Gründen des Lebens und der Erfahrung aus, und an der Hand derselben prüfen sie die Bibel. Sie fragen: Ist es wirklich wahr, daß der Mensch weder durch Lehre noch durch Vorbild, sondern allein durch

das vollgültige Opfer in dem Leiden und Sterben Jesu Christi erlöst werden konnte? Und sie fragen ferner: Ist der Einzelne sowie die Gesamtheit denn wirklich erlöst? Ja sie fragen, was bedeutet denn im vollen Sinn die Erlösung? Ist es nicht die Erlösung von dem Fluch der Sünde? Der Fluch der Sünde aber ist die Macht des Fleisches und infolge davon die Früchte des Fleisches, siehe Gal. 5, 19—21. Und das wieder ist der Ausschluß aus dem Reich Gottes. Sind die Früchte des Fleisches etwas Unbekanntes unter den Christen? Sind wir erlöst, regiert der Geist die Christen? Sind die Christen zu einem neuen Leben hindurchgedrungen? Und wenn einige Menschenkinder aus der großen Menge der Menschheit ja selbst der sogenannten Christenheit zu einem reineren Leben hindurchdringen, geschieht solches ganz ohne ihr Zutun? Und wenn dem so ist, warum geschieht es nicht an all den unzähligen, die jahraus jahrein Gelegenheit haben das Wort der Gnade zu hören? Ist es wirklich wahr, daß **nur** durch das vollgültige Opfer Jesu Christi wir erlöst werden? Zeugt nicht die eigene Erfahrung und die ganze Geschichte der christlichen Kirche dagegen? Es kann gewiß nicht an Gott liegen, denn Gott will, daß allen geholfen werde und an Gottes ewiger Liebe kann auch nicht gezweifelt werden, wohl kaum auch an seiner Allmacht. Kann da nicht irgendwo der Fehler bei uns Menschen liegen? Sollte darum der Mensch nicht berechtigt sein, etwas tiefer zu graben? Sie suchen in der Schrift und behaupten eine völlig neue Erkenntnis gefunden zu haben. Sie mag aber am Ende gar nicht so völlig neue sein, ja sie mag sogar die ursprüngliche ewige Wahrheit sein. Die Begriffe göttlicher Eigenschaften werden dadurch in Frage gestellt. Sie stellen manches um. Die Gerechtigkeit Gottes muß der Barmherzigkeit und Liebe Gottes als den größeren Eigenschaften weichen. Gott handelt gleichsam mit den Menschen nach jenem Spruch: Psalm 103, 14: „Er kennet, was für ein Gemächte wir sind, er gedenket daran, daß wir Staub sind.“ Und das erkannte nicht nur der Psalmist, darin stimmen auch fast alle Propheten mit überein. Darum verkündigen sie, daß Gott nicht durch das Blut der Ochsen, der Kälber und Böcke versöhnt werden könnte. Ja Gott will nicht einmal solche Opfer. Psalm 50, 9. 13; Psalm 51, 18; Jes. 1, 11, und damit vergleiche man sorgfältig Hebr. 10, 5—9. Wenn nun Gott, nach seiner Barmherzigkeit und Liebe, wohl wissend, was für ein Gemächte wir sind, schon das Blut der Tiere nicht forderte, wie viel weniger wird er wohl das Blut eines Menschen und dazu eines unschuldigen fordern können? Und beim weiteren Forschen in der Schrift finden sie, daß Gott das Vergießen des Menschenblutes als einen Greuel bezeichnet, 5. Mose 18, 10, 2. Kön. 16, 3 und 2. Chron. 28, 3. So folgern sie denn: Wenn Gott trotz seiner Gerechtigkeit und Heiligkeit das Vergießen von

Menschenblut verurteilt und als Greuel kennzeichnet, wie kann derselbe gerechte und heilige Gott selbst Menschenblut zur Sühne seines Zornes fordern? Sollte nicht, wie bei einem Weib, dem Kind gegenüber, die Barmherzigkeit siegen? So erkannten es die Propheten. Sie reden darum von der **Barmherzigkeit Gottes,** die einen andern Weg seiner Versöhnung sowie der Erneuerung des Menschengeschlechtes gefunden. Man lese nur Jes. 43, 24. 25; 44, 22; Jer. 31 und Hes. 36, 26 ff. Und auf Grund dieser Stellen des Alten Testaments suchen sie weiter im Neuen Testament. Und was sie hier finden, bestätigt, was im Alten Testament bezeugt wurde. Sie gedenken an die Gleichnisse des Herrn, vor allem an das vom verlorenen Sohn, in welchem ja eben die Barmherzigkeit des Vaters, wie sie die Propheten von Gott verkündigten, in so wunderschöner und ergreifender Weise uns vor die Augen gemalt wird. Sie lesen ein andres, Luk. 20, 1—17. Sie erinnern sich der Worte Jesu am Kreuz: „Vater, vergib ihnen, denn sie wissen nicht, was sie tun." Und sie finden bei weiterm Forschen, daß Petrus Acta 4, 17 dieselbe Erkenntnis hatte und Paulus schrieb an die Korinther, 1. Kor. 2, 8: „Hätten sie den Herrn der Herrlichkeit erkannt, dann hätten sie ihn nicht gekreuzigt." Und das scheint doch klar zu bestättigen, daß Paulus nicht daran gedacht haben kann, daß Jesus nach Gottes ewigem Rat hat sterben müssen. Und als eine noch viel wichtigere Stelle finden sie Hebr. 2, 10. 11: „Es geziemte dem, um deßwillen alle Dinge sind, der da viele Kinder zur Herrlichkeit geführet, daß er den Herzog ihrer Seligkeit durch **Leiden vollkommen machte.** Sintemal sie alle von einem kommen, der da heiligt und die da geheiligt werden, darum schämet er sich auch nicht, sie Brüder zu heißen." Damit vergleiche man Phil. 2, 5—11. Dies alles nun in Betracht ziehend, kommen sie zu folgenden Schlüßen: Jesus ist der Sohn Gottes, der einzigartige, über allen andern Kindern Gottes (vergleiche Röm. 8) hoch erhaben, der **vollkommene Menschensohn,** der uns ein Vorbild gelassen, daß wir sollen nachfolgen seinen Fußtapfen, der keine Sünde getan und in dessen Mund kein Betrug erfunden wurde. Dieser vollkommene Gottessohn kam in sein Eigentum, die Seinen nahmen ihn aber nicht auf. Ihre Blindheit, ihre völlige Ohnmacht, ihre Verkehrtheit und ihr gänzlich verdorbenes Wesen ist so unaussprechlich tief gesunken, daß sie aus falscher Selbstsucht, sich so weit vergaßen, daß sie den Herrn der Herrlichkeit kreuzigten. Jene Menschen aber sind nur ein kleiner Teil und Vertreter der gesamten Menschheit, denn „keiner lebt ihm selber." Die Menschheit als solche verwirft Jesus und kreuzigt ihn wie damals so durch alle Zeiten hindurch ihre Blindheit und ihren Ungehorsamz. Tiefer kann die Menschheit nicht sinken. Und was tut der Vater, was offenbart das Sterben Jesu? „Wo aber die Sünde mächtig geworden ist, da ist die Gnade noch

viel mächtiger geworden." „Und wenn eure Sünde gleich blutrot ist, soll sie doch schneeweiß werden." Wer unter dem Kreuz die ewige Liebe seines Gottes nicht findet und erkennt und darum in den Staub sinkt und aus der Tiefe seines Herzens zu Gott schreit, der wird wohl auf keine andre Weise den Weg zum Vaterherzen finden können. Hier heißt es aber nun auch, „ein jeglicher sei gesinnt, wie Jesus Christus auch war," und „wer mein Jünger sein will, der verleugne sich selbst und nehme sein Kreuz auf sich und folge mir nach." Hier gilt es der Sünde und dem Verderben und der Macht der Sünde sterben, wie auch Jesus gestorben. Nur so kann dann auch der Mensch zu einem neuen Leben auferstehen. Hier lernt er die volle Wahrheit: „Schaffet, daß ihr selig werdet, mit Furcht und Zittern, denn Gott ist es der in euch wirket, beides das Wollen und das Vollbringen." Das Kreuz wird dann zu keinem sanften Ruhekissen, sondern die wirkliche Lebensquelle. Ob die Anhänger eines solchen Evangeliums wohl so verkehrt sind und die Bibel so falsch verstehen, daß man sich mit Abscheu von ihnen wenden muß, mag doch noch eine andre Frage sein. „Prüfet alles, das Gute behaltet."

3. Die Wiederkunft Christi und Gericht.

Wir werden nun schon zur Genüge erkannt haben, daß man mit der Bibel in der Hand nicht nur eine, sondern viele Anschauungen beweisen kann. Das gilt auch wieder inbezug auf die Lehre der Wiederkunft Jesu. Der alte Glaube hält daran fest: „Von dannen er wiederkommen wird, zu richten die Lebendigen und die Toten." Und sie gehen einen Schritt weiter und sagen, sie muß wörtlich und leiblich verstanden werden. Und des Herrn Wiederkunft wird geschehen zu einer Zeit des größten Abfalls, der größten Verwüstung auf Erden. Die Bibel redet von Krieg und Kriegsgeschrei, von Erdbeben, von Trockenheit und andern schrecklichen Heimsuchungen und Trübsalen, welche kein Mensch aushalten könnte, wenn sie nicht um der Auserwählten verkürzt würden. Darum wird den Menschen auf Erden bange werden. Es werden dann Zeichen an Sonne und Mond geschehen und dann wird der Menschensohn kommen. Daraus wird nun, und man glaubt mit vollem Recht, der Schluß gezogen, daß alle Versuche der Menschen, auch recht guter Menschen, Verbesserungen zu schaffen, ganz bestimmt fehl schlagen müssen und darum weigert man sich, irgendwelche soziale oder nationale und internationale Bestrebungen zu unterstützen. Es muß, so schließt man weiter, in der letzten Zeit auf Erden immer unerträglicher werden und dann wird der Herr kommen. Dies alles ist die Ursache des hartnäckigen Widerstrebens recht ernstlicher Christen, wenn sie aufgefordert werden, in diesen oder jenen Bestrebungen ihre Hilfe doch darzureichen. Sie können es aus Ge-

wissensgründen nicht tun. Und man vergißt, daß das Gewissen eben erzogen werden muß. Die Hoffnung der Wiederkunft Christi lebte sehr stark in den Aposteln und den ersten Christen. Der Tag des Herrn war für sie nahe. Und seit der Zeit war fort und fort die Sehnsucht fast aller aufrichtiger Christen auf das Kommen des Herrn gerichtet. Die Stellen der Schrift, welche von der Wiederkunft redeten, wurden mit besondrer Sorgfalt gelesen und gar bald konnten kluge Berechnungen angestellt werden, Zeit und Stunde der Wiederkunft des Herrn nach gewissen Bibelstellen bekannt gemacht werden. Große Vorbereitungen zum Empfang des Herrn wurden dann getroffen — aber der Herr kam nicht. Und so ist es bis auf den heutigen Tag noch immer eine falsche Rechnung gewesen, die man machte. Liegt eine Möglichkeit vor, daß man sich auch in diesem Punkt getäuscht haben mag, wie in so manchen andern? Ist es möglich, daß man gewisse Bibelstellen falsch verstanden hat? Solche Fragen stellten wieder die Verteidiger des neuen Glaubens. Sie gehen frisch ans Werk, weil sie nach Gewißheit ringen. Täuschen sie sich in ihren Berechnungen, oder ihrem Verstehen, so wird das die Zukunft offenbaren. Der erste Grund ist, der Herr ist noch nicht leiblich wiedergekommen. Und dem fügen sie nun recht dreist hinzu, er wird auch noch lange nicht leiblich wiederkommen. Sie sagen mit dem Herrn: „Zeit und Stunde weiß niemand, auch des Menschensohn nicht, die hat Gott seiner Macht vorbehalten.“ Sie stellen dann ferner ein Wort des Meisters in das Zentrum dieser Frage. „Der Herr hat gesagt zu meinem Herrn, setze dich zu meiner Rechten, bis daß ich deine Feinde zum Schemel deiner Füße mache.“ Sie legen dabei vollen Nachdruck auf die Worte **„bis daß.“** Die Ueberwindung der Feinde soll aber nicht durch Heer oder Macht, sondern durch innere Ueberzeugung geschehen, so daß die Feinde zu willigen Dienern werden, zu solchen, die freudig ihre Knie vor ihm beugen und mit ihren Zungen bekennen, daß er der Herr sei zur Ehre Gottes des Vaters. Sie verweisen auf andre Stellen und geben gerne zu, daß der Herr kommt, aber nicht persönlich, er kommt auch zum Gericht, aber dieses Gericht liegt in den Händen seines Volkes. Und nach der Beschreibung dieses Gerichtes, Offb. 18, ist das Gericht so vollständig und so alle Verhältnisse auf Erden umgestaltend, daß von den alten Zuständen kaum noch ein Rest übrig geblieben ist. Es soll auch Krieg und Kriegsgeschrei verstummen nach Jes. 2 und Micha 4. Das alles aber muß das Werk der Jünger Jesu **vor** dem Kommen des Herrn sein und daneben noch vieles andre. Ist das aber schon geschehen? Haben wir einen neuen Himmel und eine neue Erde, in welcher Gerechtigkeit wohnt? Wir sind, wie offenbar ist, noch weit davon entfernt, und eben darum wird auch der Herr noch nicht kommen. Noch auf einige andre Andeutungen

soll hingewiesen werden. „Der Herr hat noch andre Schafe und die muß er auch herzuführen, so daß eine Herde unter einem Hirten werde.“ Dieses wunderbare Werk aber hat er von Anfang an seinen Jüngern befohlen. Wie weit sind wir davon noch entfernt? Sodann lesen wir Jer. 31. 34, daß das große Werk Gottes, die Neuschöpfung der Herzen, einen solchem Erfolg haben wird, daß die Menschheit ohne ein religiöses Institut Gott ehren wird und den Brüdern dienen. „Es wird keiner zu seinem Bruder sagen, erkenne den Herrn, sie werden ihn alle erkennen.“

Nur so viel mag hier angeführt werden. Und zu dem allem werden sie geführt, besonders durch ein Gleichnis des Herrn Lukas 14, 16—23. Auch hierin ist wichtig: „**Nötigt** sie herein zu kommen.“ Dies alles offenbart eine neue, ganz besondre Art, die Bibel zu lesen. Und infolge davon kommen sie zu dem natürlichen Schluß: „Wirket, so lange es Tag ist, denn es kommt die Nacht, da niemand mehr wirken kann.“ Es ist die Aufgabe der Jünger des Herrn, nicht müßig am Markt zu stehen und auf das Kommen des Herrn zu warten, sondern alle Kräfte anzuwenden, Gottes Reich zu bauen, dem Herrn, die ihm gebührende Stellung in allen Lagen menschlichen Lebens zu sichern. Der Herr, dem alle Gewalt gegeben ist, muß nicht nur im Himmel herrschen, sondern eben so sehr auf Erden. Alle Reiche müssen des Herrn werden. „Ihr sollt meine Zeugen sein,“ und „ihr werdet größere Werke tun, denn ich.“ Es liegt an uns, auf welche Seite wir treten wollen, und wie viel wir von der einen oder der andern Partei für uns persönlich aneignen wollen. „Der Herr aber sucht nicht mehr an den Haushaltern, als daß sie treu erfunden werden.“

Und nun noch eine kurze aber sehr bedeutsame Frage: Welche christliche Denomination und welches christliche Bekenntnis wird wohl in der Zukunft den größten Einfluß ausüben und infolge davon auch zum größten Segen werden? Zu diesen Fragen werden wir genötigt durch die gewaltigen Vorgänge in der ganzen Welt und besonders den großen Missionsgebieten. Man sagt uns, wir wollen Christus aber nicht **euer** Christentum. Man könnte wohl kurz antworten: Diejenige Denomination, welche durch Wort und Tat Christus am nächsten steht. Doch was bedeutet das? „In Wort und Werk und allem Wesen sei Jesus und sonst nichts zu lesen.“ Aber auch das schließt unendlich viel in sich.

Ich will nur einige Striche in dieser Richtung ziehen. Wir werden daraus sofort erkennen, daß sie unsrer ganzen Gesellschaftsordnung direkt widersprechen. Jesu ganze Stellung in der Welt, während seiner Lebenszeit, muß die Stellung aller wahrer Christen werden. Er bekannte, daß Gott der Vater aller ist, der Guten und der Bösen, darum erbarmet er sich auch aller seiner Werke.

Vor ihm gilt kein Ansehen der Person, Reiche oder Arme, Weiße oder Braune, Gelbe oder Schwarze, Gebildete oder Ungebildete, nein, Vorzüge gibt es nicht, gibt es aber solche, dann sind es in der ganzen Welt die Armen, denen das Evangelium gepredigt wird. Den Armen, den Enterbten galt seine ganze Liebe und Fürsorge, und klar machte er es, daß eher ein Kameel durch ein Nadelohr gehen könne als ein Reicher ins Reich Gottes (was man aber heute ganz gewiß nicht mehr glaubt und noch viel weniger predigt), „was hoch ist vor der Welt, das ist vor Gott ein Greuel." Aus allem dem geht dann seine weitere Stellung hervor, **kein** Mensch hat **persönliche Eigentumsrechte,** auf die wir doch alle so stolz sind, und die wir mit Leib und Seele verteidigen, wir alle sind **nur Haushalter.** Die Erde ist des Herrn und ein jeder Haushalter muß dem Herrn Rechenschaft geben über seine Haushalterschaft und wehe, wenn die Hungrigen nicht gespeist, die Durstigen nicht getränkt und die Nackenden nicht gekleidet werden.

Wehe, wenn wir Unterschiede machen, uns gerne grüßen lassen und gerne oben ansitzen, als besondre Größen in der Gesellschaft, oder aber als Angehörige einer großen Nation in der Völkerwelt. Man denke nur an solche Worte wie Imperialismus oder Kapitalismus. Und dann frage man sich allen Ernstes: Auf welcher Seite stand Jesus? Wo er stand, müssen wir stehen, und haben sie ihn Beelzebub geheißen, dann darf es uns nicht wundern, wenn sie uns auch so heißen. Das heißt neben vielem andern: „In Wort und Werk und allem Wesen sei Jesus und sonst nichts zu lesen."

EDITORIALS

WILL IT BE LUTHER OR CALVIN?

Protestants have always been strong on disagreeing, on upholding personal opinion, on contending for intellectual integrity. That has been one secret of their success, they have furnished the leaven that started the dough of humanity into ever new processes of growth and activity. It seems no accident that the leading nations of the world have largely been Protestant.

Still the Catholic Church survives and is as powerful as it ever was. Authority that could enforce unity has held it together, and the strange combination of its inflexibility with a certain adaptability has again and again been the despair of its opponents.

Protestantism has at last learned the lesson that Rome in God's providence is destined to inculcate, namely, the lesson of the *one,* holy, *universal* Christian church. The organization of the *Federal Council* of the churches of Christ 20 years ago was an indication that American Protestantism was beginning to read the signs of the times. But the Federation of churches in the Council was for practical purposes only, it did not rest on uniformity of creed or affect the independence of the individual churches. More pretentious was the movement that called many Protestant churches together in Philadelphia in 1918, to consider ways and means for an *organic union* of all Protestant faiths. It was a by-product of wartime enthusiasm, and it had no sooner flared up than it died down again.

Since then there have been efforts for consolidation on a more modest scale. The Lutherans have combined three formerly independent bodies in the United Lutheran Church; and in Canada Methodists, Presbyterians and Congregationalists have founded the United Church of Canada.

Our own Synod has not remained untouched by the wind that has been stirring in the tree tops. To afford a spiritual home to those to whom Luther and Calvin were both servants of the same Lord, was its great ideal. It has never expected that it would convert all Lutherans or all Reformed of this country to this principle. In the days of its very beginning it encountered from extreme Lutheranism a hostility so bitter and so uncompromising that it would have blighted that hope had it ever been there. On the other hand, to win over the Reformed never even occurred to it. It was an

importation from Germany, and in Germany the Reformed are a negligible quantity. They have developed, in the Western provinces, a vigorous church life, but the original stock from which our immigrants were drawn, did not come from there. The expectation of our fathers was that those who had brought from their old home a mild Lutheranism or a softened Calvinism might find with us just what they wanted. Our growth in the first period of our history was such that we had no reason to think that our principles had not sufficient drawing power. According to Schory ("Geschichte . . . ") we had in *1888 55,000* families under our care. At six heads a family—then a modest scale—that meant over 300,000 souls. In the early nineties we grew again considerably, but when immigration stopped, we stopped to grow. In the last 25 years our numbers have remained more or less stationary.

In the mean time, however, we have grown to be largely an English-speaking body and have sought and found a *place* in *American Protestantism.* According to size we rank only fifteenth, or thereabouts, on the roll of American Protestant churches. In other words, we find that we are one of the less significant denominations. Hence the complaint that we have made no "appreciable contribution to American Protestantism." It would never have occurred to our fathers to grieve about that, for, first, they lived in days of phenomenal growth, and, second, they *did not expect* to make an impression on American Protestantism. Largely Lutheran in spirit, they were satisfied with the culture of the religious life; to impress the world with the numbers, the schools, the theology, the literature of the church, much less with its power in legislation and politics, would have seemed utterly *worldly* to them. They never tried to assert themselves, they were satisfied if they were left alone.

This somewhat quietistic spirit of the fathers was bound to be greatly modified by our immerging into the vigorous flow of American church life. The American churches are largely Calvinistic. By that we do not mean that they have Calvin's theology, least of all his predestinationism. We have in mind his emphasis on life rather than on doctrines; on work more than on faith; the freedom of the church from the state; the influence of the church on public life; the aggressive and assertive spirit of Calvinism in general. This spirit entered into a natural fusion with the genius of a vigorous race on a new continent, and the two together have produced the American church. More and more it has shed the swaddling clothes of orthodox theology and judges everything by the pragmatic test: does it work, will it pay? Long enough has the church wasted time on metaphysics, now let her show what she can do to give ful-

ness of life to the individual and to realize the Kingdom of God in this world.

Our own Synod feels the pull of these vital forces. Our younger men, especially, are eager for her to heed the challenge of the new age. They are afraid if she persists in her policy of isolation, other churches will draw together and get strong and she will be left alone, bewailing her short-sightedness when it is too late and seeing before her the unenviable fate of gradual decay. What can we do under these circumstances, so asks R. Niebuhr (in his letter to the Editor, last January), to let in new blood and take a more creditable place in American Protestantism? He says, we can *unite with* the *Reformed Church*. They are a kindred body; they are probably willing; and, together, we should have 600,000 communicants.

N. knows well that our Synod, more Lutheran than Reformed in spirit, feels more drawn to Wittenberg than to Geneva, but, he says, the Lutherans don't want us. He is right in this. Only recently the Editor conferred with a representative man from the United Lutheran Church and was told that an organic union with them would be out of the question; there might possibly some sort of a looser relation be found, etc. There is not the shadow of a doubt but that the Synod and the Lutheran Church will not mix.

So if we want to unite, the Reformed Church is the only possible chance. Niebuhr made this suggestion once before, in 1919, and met with vigorous opposition. Many perhaps have not changed their attitude. All those of Lutheran lineage or leaning would strenuously insist that the *unionistic principle be not sacrificed* in a possible merger. If, for instance, the Reformed demanded the adoption of their name in the new denominator, that would seem to bar an agreement. The "United Evangelical Church of America" might satisfy the Evangelicals, but how would it strike the Reformed?

The Editor cannot commit himself on the question; he knows too little of the Reformed Church. It appears to have shared with us the fate that, so far, it has not contributed much to American Protestantism. If it had, our union with them would probably be in the nature of an absorption. This writer could get along with, and even in, the Reformed Church; he was brought up in it, although confirmed in the Lutheran church (in Germany).

At any rate, it would not hurt us to enter into negotiations with the Reformed. We could then more intelligently judge what a union with them would mean to us in obligations and in privileges.

WHY DOES THE JEWISH RABBI THROW THE PROTESTANT MINISTER IN THE SHADE?

We trust we shall not be considered provincial when we frequently get our clue for an Editorial from local conditions. The American public is, on the one hand, a combination of many nationalities, on the other hand, various factors have welded it to a surprising degree into homogeneity. The public school, political institutions, the press have done conspicuous service in creating a feeling of solidarity. A hundred million people live together on one continent with no barriers to political or commercial intercourse. This fact has made possible mass production in all commodities. To render this production cheap, nearly everything we produce has been standardized. Our papers, comics, movies, theatres, automobiles, patent medicines, styles of architecture, radios, etc., are the same all over the country. As a result we all live alike, read, think, build alike. One city is largely like every other, except in size; and conditions in one part of the country are very much the same as in others. What is, therefore, true of Cleveland is true of other large cities and of cities not so large.

In Cleveland the rabbis, or some of them, are the greatest drawing card to the general public, and, so we believe, they are in New York, Chicago and Philadelphia. We have two distinguished rabbis here, Silver and Brickner. Wherever they appear they speak to crowded houses. Of the 200 Protestant ministers here there is not one who would even remotely compete with them in popularity and influence. They speak at civic functions, high school exercises, lodge festivals, in women's organizations, and even in Protestant churches. And when they do speak it is an event and the papers take due notice. Why can the rabbis do what the ministers cannot do?

In the first place, of course, it has to be stated that only the two men mentioned are so conspicuously successful. The rabbis as a class are more or less in obscurity. Those two are the leaders of two very wealthy congregations, drawing salaries of something like $30,000, it is said. They are therefore probably the pick of their class, and the more money you pay the stronger the man you get. Still, there are wealthy Christian congregations here, paying also large salaries, whose ministers are little prominent.

Is then the Jewish race possessed of such talents that it is hopeless for other races to enter into competition with them? It is true these two rabbis far outshine our own local men in oratorical gifts. I heard R. Silver, on Armistice Day, deliver an oration that far surpassed any Protestant minister I ever heard here. Yet, the

history of oratory by no means awards the crown to the people of Israel. Demosthenes, Cicero, Mirabeau, the elder Pitt, Burke, D. Webster, Beecher were all sons of other races.

The reason must possibly be sought in other quarters. There is a wide-spread indifference today to questions of creed and dogma. Protestant people have been fed upon these things in the past. Now the reaction is strong in the direction of a one-sided emphasis on life and principles. People don't care about a man's faith if he only lives right. The important thing is not whether he is Protestant, Catholic or Jew, but whether he is an honest man. Let every man have what religion he prefers, but let him be sincere. If religious people can't agree on what they believe, let them work together for the establishment of a better world. Even many Christian ministers (Cadman, Lichliter, etc.) say, give up trying to convert the Jew; rather cooperate with him in making a better community.

The Jewish rabbi, of the liberal sort, agrees exactly with that philosophy. He is a theist, he believes in a personal God. R. Brickner, in the near future, is going to debate here with Clarence Darrow on the question, Is man a machine?—the rabbi taking the negative side. When belief in God is given and admitted, the rabbis are willing to let other things slide. They believe in historic religion. They are convinced there is inspiration in their own history; but bear in mind, they are not looking for the coming Messiah any more. They reject Jesus as the divinely given fulfiller of messianic hopes, but they are not expecting any other either. In some way they hope to draw powers of revival from their history, their faith, from science and literature, from all the sources German "Idealism" sought and seeks to draw from. So it can be seen that to a large extent they are in harmony with the tendencies of the modern mind; and because they are and are eloquent exponents of it, they get a hearing.

They talk, by the way, little of religion; only in a general way. They talk, however, of the social implications of religion—and their people allow them great freedom in chastising capitalism and materialism—of literature; the latest "best seller" in fiction or philosophy; of civic subjects; companionate marriages; woman's rights, etc. They never convert any one to Judaism. Yet they make themselves heard in public life, and enjoy it; and their people are proud of them.

The Christian minister, if nature has denied him equal gifts, would be foolish to be envious of the rabbi. But if he is a minister of *Christ* he would be handicapped in the race even if he had the gifts.

Ist Christus „primus inter pares"?

Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule gibt bekanntlich den Anspruch auf, daß die christliche Religion die absolute sei. Sie habe allerdings den bisher höchsten Stand religiöser Entwicklung erreicht, aber niemand könne sagen, daß eine Weiter- und Höherentwicklung in der Zukunft außer dem Bereich der Möglichkeit sei. Das erinnert an das Diktum der ihr vorausgehenden spekulativen Theologie, daß es der Idee nicht beliebe, ihren ganzen Inhalt in ein einzelnes Individuum auszuschütten.

Die religionsgeschichtliche Anschauung hat ihre sehr praktischen Konsequenzen auf dem **Missionsgebiet.** Ist die christliche Religion nicht die absolute, dann geziemt uns, andre Religionen mit viel mehr Unparteilichkeit zu studieren und zu beurteilen. Sie mögen uns weniger zusagen, aber ihren Anhängern um so mehr. Christus ist der Lehrer des Okzidents, aber hat nicht der Orient, der ihn hervorgebracht, andre Namen, die ihm, Christo, an Glanz wenig nachstehen? Wir denken heute so viel dem **Mystischen** in der Religion nach: wo aber ist der klassische Boden des Mystischen als im Orient?

Man erinnert sich, daß nach dem Russisch-Japanesischen Krieg viele die Ueberzeugung aussprachen, daß das siegreiche Japan kaum das Christentum annehmen werde ohne große Abstriche und Modificationen; als wäre es zuviel verlangt, daß diese gelbe Rasse den Heiland der weißen akzeptieren werde, ohne daß er sich vor dem Kaiser und seinen Ahnen verbeuge. Seit dem hat aber wenigstens die Missionswelt ihr Gleichgewicht wieder mehr gewonnen. Es war uns aus der Seele gesprochen, als bei der diesjährigen Pastorenkonferenz in Columbus (über 1100 Pastoren anwesend) der altbewährte Missionsmann Dr. **R. Speer** es klar und deutlich aussprach, daß bei dem Kommen des Evangeliums zu den Heiden **Christus nichts** von andern Religionen **borgt,** daß in ihm die ganze Fülle der Gottheit wohnt. Es gebe keine absolute Rasse, sagte er, aber das Christentum ist die absolute Religion. Nicht als wenn irgendeine Kirche den Inhalt der Wahrheit schon völlig ausgeschöpft habe; aber er ist da und tritt mehr und mehr ans Licht. Missionsmethoden, -anschauungen, -praxis müssen vielfach sich dem erwachten Nationalgefühl heidnischer Völker anpassen. In heidnischen Religionen müssen mehr Anknüpfungspunkte mit der christlichen gesucht und ausgebeutet werden. Aber Christus ist der Heiland der Welt, nicht Buddha oder irgendein andrer.

Es war herzstärkend, Speer aus eigener Anschauung beschreiben zu hören, wie sich Christus und sein Evangelium **durch den Tatbeweis** als das Heil auch dieser Heidenvölker erweist. Man spricht in Indien oft von „Reischristen," von solchen, die das Christentum um seiner äußeren Vorteile annehmen. Dem gegenüber

betonte Speer, daß das erste, was die Kirchen in Japan erstreben, ist, sich finanziell unabhängig zu machen. Sie haben Selbstachtung und Ehrlichkeit genug, daß sie lieber darben als Unterstützung annehmen. Ihre eingeborenen Pastoren leben von unglaublich kleinem Gehalt, aber wie der Apostel haben sie gelernt, Mangel zu leiden, und wie er erstatten sie, was fehlt, durch die Arbeit ihrer Hände. Noch wunderbarer war, was er von ihrer Lernbegierde erzählte. Im Norden des Landes besuchte er in abgelegener Gegend einen Dorfpastor, dessen Gehalt 30 Dollars das Jahr betrug. Aber in seiner Bibliothek fand Speer Werke von oder über Kant, Spinoza, Ottos „Das Heilige," Sohms Abriß der Kirchengeschichte, Keyser, Evolution und zahlreiche andre Werke dieser Art; alle in englischer Sprache. Und wie geistig vorwärtsstrebend, so sind sie geistlich treu und heldenmütig. Wie einst jenes Christenmädchen sich weigerte, auf dem Altar der Diana ein wenig Weihrauch zu streuen, obwohl man ihr sagte, sie verleugne ihren Glauben nicht, es sei nur eine Konzession an lokale Gebräuche, so weigert sich heute der japanische Christ, dem Kaiserkultus auch nur die geringste Akkomodation zu machen, obgleich es nur für einen Akt der Loyalität gelten soll.

Aehnliche Beispiele erzählte er von Korea und seinen heroischen Christen. Es war beschämend für amerikanische Christen, mit solcher Hingabe, solchem Opfermut, solchem Zeugengeist ihre eigene Mattherzigkeit zu vergleichen.

Aber es ließ das Feuer des zuversichtlichen Glaubens neu aufflammen, daß der Christus, der solches heute im fernen Asien tun kann, nicht bloß „primus inter pares," sondern der Eingeborene Gottes ist, und daß die Stunde immer näher rückt, wo auch die Heiden in seinem Licht wandeln werden. Wie nach Paulus die Heiden die Juden reizen sollen, in die Nachfolge Jesu einzutreten, so kann heute die Missionswelt der alten Christenheit ein Sporn sein, die erste Liebe nicht zu lassen und wieder zu tun die ersten Werke.

The Christian World

Methodist Conference on Evangelism

The Christian Advocate, New York, November 24, 1927

More than 1,000 ministers and laymen of Troy, Northern New York, Central New York and Genesee Conferences met in First Church, Syracuse, N. Y., for the first Buffalo Area Conference on Evangelism, November 10 and 11, Bishop Adna Wright Leonard presiding.

Bishops Berry, Mead, Smith and Henderson assisted Bishop Leonard with the program. Addresses were also given by Dr. H. E. Woolever, editor of The National Methodist Press; Frank Ryder, president of Laymen's Association of Troy Conference; Dr. W. A. Godsave, director of religious education in Northern New York Conference; and Dr. James S. Baker, director of Wesley Foundation. Every phase of evangelism was covered by the speakers.

Significant pronouncements of some of the speakers were as follows:

Bishop Leonard: "Too many churches want a pastor who is a crowd-getter, but are not concerned about his being a soul-winner." "Behavioristic psychology is becoming a detriment to Christianity." "Man must have a spiritual experience which no psychologist can explain." "Christ the Lord must be real to us as a personal Saviour." "As ministers and laymen we must lay aside the unimportant and give ourselves unreservedly to this one business of getting men to God."

Dr. Godsave: "We must understand the spiritual needs of childhood and youth in order to build an adequate program of religious education. By proper surroundings, program and teaching, we shall bring them to know the truth, to love it more than life itself, and then to give outward expression of it."

Mr. Ryder: "Much of our trouble results from weakness of will. God can strengthen our wills. Only the power, the love and the knowledge of God can save the world."

Dr. Woolever: "In the early days of Methodism it was the rule that each member should get another member every year. In 1926 the Methodist Episcopal Church did not register a net increase of one member for each minister." "The printed page, which has always played an important part in the program of Methodism, is still an indispensable asset in the evangelistic activity of the Church."

Bishop Smith: "As Jesus was tempted to use His power for wrong ends, so the Church and the ministry today are often tempted to misuse their authority and power for material ends. The greater the power, the greater the temptation. God has protected the Church from a misuse of power, however, for when we misuse power, we lose God, and without God there is no power." "The greatest emphasis must not be placed on social Christianity. The first task of the minister is to get men to Christ. The minister has a complex character.

He must be a priest, a prophet, a teacher, an executive, and he must face the total task confronting him, having a balanced program."

Bishop Mead: "Methodism lost 18,000 members last year, while other interests have grown by leaps and bounds. But youth is the world's fresh start. Age lives in reminiscence, while youth lives in prophecy. There is a close relationship between childhood and God. We emphasize the physical preparation for parenthood. It is much more important to stress the spiritual preparation of these who are to nurture the souls of little children. It is the business of the Church to create a proper climate for the development of the spiritual lives of youth."

Dr. Baker: "The youth of today are placing a new emphasis upon religion. They are hungry for the release of spiritual power."

Bishop Henderson: "Either communicate your religion or change it. The evangelistic task is not exclusively a ministerial profession. The laymen must share the responsibility. We cannot disseminate Christianity unless God disseminates us. . . . The Ephesian revival is a good guide for our present-day evangelistic endeavors. Get the laymen organized and working; give place to the Holy Spirit through prayer; make a visitation from house to house; have special meetings where men can make decision and accept Christ. Put your heart into the task. There is a relation between the tears of Jesus and the resurrection of Lazarus, and there is a relation between the tears of Paul and the bonfire at Ephesus."

A findings committee summed up the convictions of the delegates in a report from which we quote:

Our Call to Evangelistic Work

"Evidently the heart of the Church is hungering for God. And upon us the seal of the Holy Spirit has rested during every session. Our area has faced the challenge to undertake a real program of evangelism. We are confident that the challenge will be met, and that on every district and in every Church, winning people to Christ and building them up in Christ will be the chief emphasis. We call on all our ministers and laymen to join heart and soul in the Spiritual Crusade.

"Agreed we are that back of all effective evangelistic methods, and before we may expect an increase in the fruits of our ministry, there must be a new evangelistic mind. We therefore do not declare for any specific method, but rather for a definite consecrated purpose, believing that we should be all things to all men, willing to use this method or that, as the Spirit may lead in the circumstances.

"We seek the fellowship and co-operation of our brethren everywhere who will join with us in searching for the will of God. To this end we ask the General Conference of 1928 to give first and foremost consideration to those means of grace which will be most effective in carrying out the paramount mission of the Church, the saving of the lost.

"Likewise, we seek the definite and purposeful co-operation of all the agencies of the Church. We ask that our editors and publishing

agents give special emphasis to the preparation and circulation of tracts, leaflets, books and literature which will be of a definite evangelistic character and urge our pastors to make a larger use of these proven means of Christian culture. We pray that those at the head of the schools and colleges fostered by our denomination give special stress to the claims of Jesus Christ upon the youth of today. We urge all the boards and commissions of our Church to so direct their activities during the next quadrennium as to give special emphasis to evangelism. We commend the advancing program of religious education, with a stress upon definite decisions for Christian discipleship, and especially do we urge that the children of our constituency be brought up to attend and profit by the regular worship services of the Church.

"Praying that God will send anew a revival passion upon the Church, the spirit of our conference has indicated that each of the hundreds of laymen and ministers making up this body has offered the prayer: "Our Fatner, begin this revival in me."

The Third Annual Catholic Conference

The Living Church, Milwaukee, November 5, 1927

It is noteworthy and significant that the Catholic life, not Catholic ceremonial, was emphasized throughout the Congress. The Bishop of Albany in his address of welcome, the Congress preacher in his sermon at the solemn High Mass, and the chairman in his introductory address dwelt upon holiness.

It is fitting at the beginning of a report of the Congress to quote earnest words from the chairman's opening address, from the address of welcome, and from the Congress sermon.

The Rev. Frank L. Vernon, D.D., rector of St. Mark's Church, Philadelphia, chairman, said: "Of unity, holiness, catholicity, apostolicity, we are moved to select the note of holiness for emphasis. . . It is high time we had an unfaltering belief in holiness, an unswerving allegiance to standards of living which are above debate. . . . Fasting communion is more important than High Mass. Confession is more important than incense. . . . First of all we must have holy priests, holiness must be their first concern. Sacraments and prayer must be the chief business of our parochial life. Our churches must be above all else houses of prayer. Ritual must be adequate, but it must above all things be sincere. Worship must be in spirit and in truth."

The Rt. Rev. Richard H. Nelson, D.D., Bishop of Albany, in welcoming the delegates, said: "We are assembled here because of our devotion to Him in whom dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and in whom the children of men find eternal life. . . . The saints represent a great spiritual fellowship who have sought to know Him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. The dominating purpose of their lives is the same as that which has drawn us together, and we shall not depart from the truth if we define the Catholic Church as the company of All Saints who are joined in sacramental union with Him who is the spiritual Head of mankind."

The Rev. J. G. H. Barry, D.D., rector of the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, New York, and Congress preacher, continued this appeal for holy living:

"Catholicity is not and cannot be an individual thing. It is social, and the true Catholic is an energetic force for righteousness in the community to which he belongs. He is a Christian citizen. He is visualizing all questions from a Christian point of view. Not only is teaching the Christian religion an obligation we have accepted, but at the same time we have accepted the serious obligation of living it.

"I would appeal to Anglo-Catholics on that platform; the platform of a Catholic life. That we should make it impossible that we be any longer known as those who indulge in certain ceremonial habits which would be harmless did they not indicate a certain Romeward tendency, or lay stress on certain doctrines which are unusual in the Episcopal Church; but as those who stand first of all for certain fundamental principles of living, to whom holiness is the supreme quality and vocation of the Christian, the reason of his existence and the condition of his attainment to his end."

The Rev. Charles Jarvis Harriman, rector of the Church of St. James-the-Less, Philadelphia, definitely defended the Catholic position on commonly raised questions, and his defense led to the larger position of loyalty to our Lord. "The sum of it all is," he concluded, "that our loyalty is not only to a cause or to an organism but to a personal Christ, the Son of God."

Fr. Harriman said the loyalty of the Anglo-Catholic group in the Episcopal Church had been called in question.

"We believe and do these things, not because they are Roman, but because they are right. They are more than Roman, they are Catholic, and the Episcopal Church is Catholic. Its name is Protestant Episcopal, but protestant is a word of various meanings. It was used of the ancient Church of England. At the Reformation she was not made new, but made free. To the jibe—where was your Church before the Reformation? the retort is—where was your face before it was washed?

"If by protestant you mean disowning papal obedience, sharing the movement for freedom, education, and individual development; public worship in English; the open Bible; we are Protestant. If you mean anti-catholic, especially in the spirit of the sheet and hood, every man to choose his own Church, a complete break with the past, the dilemma between fundamentalism and modernism—if you mean by protestant what most Protestants seem to mean, we are not protestant, and God forbid we ever should be.

"The men who named the Protestant Episcopal Church meant to keep to the historic Church, as they showed by the Prayer Book. They were Episcopal, retaining bishops as had been since the apostles' time, but protestant in doing so apart from the papal system; protestant in the English sense, successors of established episcopacy, not dissent. Episcopal, the name by which we are commonly known, defines our position. Protestant describes so well what we are not, it is barely honest to use it. We should drop the word Protestant, and

put nothing in its place, and be known as the Episcopal Church."

The Rev. Julian D. Hamlin, rector of St. John's Church, Newport, R. I., read a paper, The Nature of the Church. Fr. Hamlin adequately traced the natural growth and historic development of the Church, but eloquently portrayed the Divine Society which he suggested must seldom have been absent from the mind of Jesus.

"What did our Lord leave behind Him? Not a book, but a record of His life, not a creed; but a fellowship of men and women bound to each other by a common allegiance to Him and by a victorious faith in His resurrection. It was to this fellowship that the baptism of the Holy Spirit came on Pentecost.

"Immediately the little Church was obsessed by a divine sense of mission, regarded herself as the fulfilment of the old order, possessed new coherence and unity, more adequate than the prophets ever dreamed.

"The chief glory of the Book of Common Prayer is that it has never allowed us to forget that our membership in Christ involves membership in a Christian body which is far larger than the Protestant Episcopal Church, of which the Anglican communion is but a part, and which it has never repudiated by any official expression of its mind."

The Solemn High Mass

On Wednesday morning at 10:30 the solemn pontifical Mass in the Cathedral of All Saints was the climax of the Congress. At the close of this impressive service, the congregation of 2,500 people who thronged the cathedral knelt and received the blessing of Bishop Nelson as he proceeded through the aisle.

The Sessions of the Second Day

The Rt. Rev. Campbell Gray, D. D., Bishop of Northern Indiana, whose subject was The Faithful Departed, made tender reference, before reading his paper, to the beautiful and unforgettable speech made by the late Bishop Brown at General Convention in New Orleans when he rose to plead for the practice of prayers for the dead, suggesting no more appropriate place and time than in the very center of the Holy Communion service.

Bishop Gray gave a very clear and simple explanation of the intermediary state of the departed. The prejudice against the word "purgatory," he said, originated from the abuses which clustered about this doctrine, purgation in reality being remedial and not vengeful. He said the arguments against prayers for the dead would be equally valid against prayers for the living. "The highest act of prayer is sacrifice," said Bishop Gray. "As for the living, so also for the dead, the most powerful thing we can do for them is to offer the Holy Sacrifice at the altar."

Our Lady and the Saints

Our Lady and the saints, having been turned out of our churches about four hundred years ago, and the doors slammed behind them, came back through the windows." Thus the Rev. Spence Burton, Superior S.S.J.E., prefaced his admirable paper, Our Lady and the

Saints. He suggested practical methods for putting his theories into practice, such as shrines with votive candles at images and windows of the saints. Particularly he suggested praying for missionaries at the shrines of great missionaries, "and there lighting candles in honor of Him who is the Light of the World." He distinguished clearly between *latria* and *dulia*. A fine feature of this paper was the plea for Christian fellowship, cultivated and nurtured by companionship with the saints and prayerful concern for the poor, the sick, the needy, the submerged, and the oppressed.

At the Wednesday evening session the Ven. John Cole McKim, with Fr. Sakurai, S.S.J.E., representing the Church in Japan, brought greetings from the Catholic Congress there. The Rev. Robert E. Wood, of the China mission, spoke as a representative of the Holy Catholic Church of China.

Lawson Purdy, L.L.D., secretary and general director of the Charity Organization Society, New York, expressed satisfaction in the growing desire of theological seminaries to give instruction in social work, as the clergy ought to be informed concerning social resources and problems. "Forty years ago I thought it was the duty of the clergy to preach the rights of man. I thought the message of freedom and justice so appealing that when stated it would be accepted. I saw men suffer for that belief and saw their ministry wrecked. Now I believe the clergy should first have regard for their ministry to individual souls and avoid such public utterances as may lessen their usefulness for their primary priestly function. Within these limitations they should embrace such opportunities as they may have to further the rule of right."

Dr. Purdy developed the fundamental principle of sacrifice and pain and of happiness through perfect adaption to environment.

The Missionary Charter of the Church was the subject of the paper by the Rev. Robert F. Lau, D.D., of the National Council.

"The Church could not cease to be missionary without ceasing to be. Evangelization was the justification of the existence of the early Church. It grew not by insistence upon faith and order but by missionary zeal. . . . Interest in the missionary program of the Church is the acid test of the claim to be Catholic. We must justify our existence as Catholics by sharing in the missionary enterprise of our communion. Otherwise we have a name that we are living but are dead."

Dr. Lau put some very pertinent questions, such as the desire at home for paid choirs and the desire in China for hospitals.

Two College Presidents

Kenneth C. M. Sills, LL.D., president of Bowdoin College, read a paper on The Church and Education. He spoke strongly in favor of the religious day school and of the realization it gives children that the community is interested in religious instruction, albeit the whole plan is yet experimental. He referred to the attempt to get rid of parochial schools as thoroughly vicious and un-American. He referred also with a degree of satisfaction to the faculty of the Church for

private schools and suggested that they should include children from a greater range of homes, especially those of working men. He likewise referred to our Church colleges as being distinguished for graduating men of real culture.

"It is a mistake to treat the college student as a type and not as an individual. He needs a priest for the same reason the rest of us do. . . . Laymen as well as clergy should try to keep more in touch with the religious life of boys and girls in college. Frequently they have no hint that people take the least interest in their Church relations, hence is it any wonder they feel religion is of no particular importance?"

Dr. Sills emphasized the great and perennial need of better training for the Christian ministry:

"We should strive to make our theological seminaries equal to other schools of medicine, law, science, and business training. The type of men studying for Orders is improving, but stronger men should be encouraged. We need to pay more attention to the scholarship of teachers in our seminaries. . . . It is the fault of the Church that not more men are devoted to scholarship. We provide no means for scholarly men to live scholarly lives, and the Church cannot hold its own without scholarly leadership."

Following Dr. Sills, the president of St. Stephen's College, the Rev. Barnard I. Bell, D.D., read a paper on The Church, the College Student, and Morals.

"Confused thinking and confused talking undermines the respect of undergraduates for so-called Christian morals. It is futile to attempt to make people live like Christians when they are not Christians. We live in a pagan world as did the Lord Jesus Christ and as did St. Paul. Christians are now and always have been and probably always will be a minority. What is right for others is not right for us, and what is wrong for us may not be wrong for them. We should say to the student, If you wish Christ's grace, if you believe He is the way, the sustainer and lover of souls ,then accept only the ethical judgment of those who through the centuries have lived near Him and learned about Him. . . . The way to change the undergraduate's morals and to ensure that he shall continue to maintain the standards of Christendom is to make him a Catholic Christian—and there is no other way in the world."

The Rev. Charles Townsend, Jr., rector of the Church of the Good Shepherd, Rosemont, Pa., read a paper, Saints in the Making. "If we want to be saints we have the power to become saints. The real enemy of our spiritual life is commonplace dullness of routine and the lack of desire for the life of prayer and devotion. This is demonstrated by the disregard of daily Mass and the disinterest in holy days. . . . We who call ourselves Catholic Christians need to make much more of the good old evangelical truth of assurance, the keynote of true evangelicalism, without which there can be no true Catholicism. . . .

"The Episcopal Church will continue to nurture respectable Chris-

tians but will never make saints until in every parish and mission, every city and hamlet, she restores the Sacrament of the Altar to the central place in her worship. . . . The need, the purpose, the only goal of the Christian religion and therefore of the Catholic is to make saints in the image and after the likeness of the sacred humanity of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Conclusion

The official report of the registration of the Congress is that 1,033 persons were enrolled, while many unregistered persons attended the various sessions.

There were eight altars in the cathedral and Masses were said from 6 to 9 o'clock daily. There were communions at 7 and 8. On Thursday a requiem Mass was said in the chapel of St. Michael and All Angels for Bishop Lines, at which the Rev. C. N. Lathrop was celebrant.

A concert was played on the new municipal carillon of Albany specially for the Congress during the noon hour on Thursday.

How Lutheranism Lapsed from Liberalism

The Christian Century, Chicago, November 10, 1927

Miles H. Krumbine

The one question that I am asked more frequently than any other by my non-Lutheran friends goes something like this: "How, in the light of Luther's great freedom of spirit, can you explain the ultra conservatism of the American Lutheran church of today?" Frankly, until I read Dr. Vergilius Ferm's "The Crisis in American Lutheran Theology" I could not explain it. The mental daring, the catholicity of spirit, the marked spontaneity and frank avowal of personal conviction of Luther—especially the Luther of those great days before 1525—always seemed utterly unlike anything I ever knew or experienced in the Lutheran church of my time. This book makes it plain enough. It is really a sad story.

The Lutheran church in the United States began its career under the leadership of Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg, known as the "patriarch" of the denomination, who came to this country in 1742 to give some kind of coherence to the scattered congregations founded before that date. He brought with him the spirit of the pietistic movement then prevalent in Germany under the direction of Spencer and Francke. The whole passion of that movement was concentrated on practical piety as against the rigid adherence to the symbolic books, especially to the "Formula of Concord" of 1580, which had prevailed hitherto. Not that Muhlenberg in America or Spencer and Francke in Germany renounced the symbolical books. They did not renounce them. They only shifted their center of interest.

In 1792, the Pennsylvania ministerium, the mother synod of the Lutheran church in America, revised its constitution, leaving out not only any reference to the historic Lutheran symbols but also any mention of the Augsburg confession. At the same time, there grew up

a steadfast fellowship with the German Reform church, which gave rise to a great many union churches throughout the east, a fact that continues even today. The New York ministerium called as its second president Dr. F. H. Quitman, a graduate of Halle and a doctor of divinity of Harvard. Dr. Quitman was a frank American exponent of the rationalistic movement that was then taking shape under the Halle professor, Johann Semler.

The year 1818 marks an ejoch in American Lutheran church history. In that year, the first effort was put forth looking toward the organization of a general synod to comprise within its fellowship the various Lutheran synods in the country. When the general synod was finally set up, its constitution contained no mention, either implicity or explicity, of the historical symbolical books of the church; not even the Augsburg confession. It plainly respected differences of opinion, both as to polity and doctrine. It placed on record an earnest desire to welcome any movement looking toward concord and unity of Christians of whatever kind of denomination.

Meanwhile, in 1820, the German Evangelical synod of Tennessee was organized. This event may be taken as the first organized effort to bring the Lutheran church back to a confessional consciousness. While never affiliating with the general synod, this movement set in motion a trend toward confessionalism, which was destined to sweep over the entire American Lutheran church.

Then appears on the scene the greatest figure since Muhlenberg, Samuel S. Schmucker, the founder of Gettysburg college and the founder, first professor and president of the Lutheran theological seminary at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. Not only was Schmucker the great theologian of the church, the teacher of something like four hundred Lutheran ministers, but he was a practical statesman as well. It was his effort that saved the general synod from disaster and gave coherence and unity to the American Lutheran church. His influence was the ruling factor in American Lutheranism for more than a generation.

Under the leadership of this redoubtable champion of a liberal interpretation of the historic documents, there was coming into being a very distinct type of Lutheranism which he himself called "American Lutheranism." Meanwhile, the tide of immigration from Germany had set in. These immigrants brought with them the prevailing spirit of their day in Germany. Known in America as "Old Lutherans," they were distinctly different from the American Lutheranism of Schmucker and his followers. They were strictly confessional in character. Newly organized synods now sprang up and grew rapidly. No less than thirty-two were organized in the twenty years between 1840 and 1860.

The individual synods of the general synod found themselves in constant contact with these reactionary groups. In view of the definitely confessional character of their position, it seemed wise to Schmucker and the men associated with him that the general synod take a definite doctrinal position. To this end, he had a hand in draft-

ing an anonymous document known as the "Definite Synodical Platform," and here he made his great mistake.

The definite synodical platform was calculated to give voice to the spirit of American Lutheranism. Its specific point was for a doctrinal basis that would confine itself to the apostles creed, the Nicene creed and the Augsburg confession. The Augsburg confession, however, was presented not as the more confessionally-minded bodies knew it but in an "American recension." In his recension, those elements of the confession that were objectionable to the minds of men like Schmucker were (1) the approval of the ceremonies of the mass; (2) of private confession and absolution; (3) the denial of the divine obligation of the Christian sabbath; (4) baptismal regeneration; and (5) the real presence of the body and blood of the Savior in the eucharist.

A very bitter controversy began to rage immediately. As the time came for the synod to take action on the definite platform, it became obvious that American Lutheranism was doomed. The action of the general synod never turned fairly on the merits of the document because the bitterness of the controversy became so great that the very integrity of the Lutheran church of the general synod was at stake. It became necessary, for the sake of its life, to promote a program of peace and harmony and, in that process Schmucker's work came to naught. By 1857, not only was the definite synodical platform cast into limbo, but the very leadership of Schmucker was utterly rejected; and thus ended the era of American Lutheranism.

It is one of the irionies of life that within ten years after 1857, Schmucker's own son, his brother-in-law and Dr. Charles Porterfield Krauth, one o fhis students and an intimate friend, became protagonists of the confessional point of view and the new spirits in the great schism of the Lutheran church. It was during that period that the general council was organized. Meanwhile, the civil war was on that brought into being the general synod of the south. The old general synod continued on its way, nourishing a liberal spirit, at least among a minority of its leaders. In 1918, these three bodies joined in what is now the United Lutheran church of America. It is not unfair to say that, in that union there is left little, if any, trace of American Lutheranism as it was, for the trend in the United Lutheran church is certainly toward an increasing confessionalism.

The Turning Point

America (Catholic), New York, August 27th, 1927

EDWARD J. LYNG

There are few subjects of ecclesiastical interest in America which offer a wider field for spiritual effort and success, and, at the same time, there is no question vexing the minds of the hierarchy and of the clergy in general that is more acute, than the Italian question.

Apart from personal enthusiasm, the only justification for re-opening a subject which bristles with doubt is the complete change and the undeniable revival which are apparent in all groups of Italian people in America. The casual visitor to an Italian settlement and

the most indifferent tyro in settlement work will advance the same conviction that a change, real, palpable and profound, is going on at the present time among the natives of Italy upon our shores and their American offspring.

Restrictive immigration has been more noticeable and more keenly felt among the Italians than any other class of Europeans who are accustomed to find in America a haven of safety and the golden land of opportunity. For almost four years the law has been in operation, with the result that conditions that prevailed less than a decade ago have changed. Time was when the Italian and his child were segregated and isolated not only geographically and ethnically but even industrially and, sad to say, religiously, so that being thrown back upon the customs of their own country and upon certain familiar practices of religion, they did not actually measure up to the standards of Catholicism or citizenship as conceived in America.

This condition of affairs cannot be said to have really fostered the spirit of religion in the Italian immigrant or his children; as a result, many thousands of them for a superabundance of reasons drifted away from the moorings of religion. Great insistence was and is, perhaps, today laid upon street processions and extravagant devotions about statues, streets in gala array with vari-colored lights and gay festoons of flowers intertwined with the national colors of America and Italy, the vigorous blare of noisy bands that upon every occasion seem to select secular and spirited music in preference to the somber and impressive notes of the religious composers. All these, we claim, had and have a tendency to produce a distinctly artificial relation to the Church and the Sacraments, and to create the impression that the accidental and the non-essential features of religion made up for virtue, piety and the practices of Faith. Let it not be imagined that we decry the outbursts of the patriotic and romantic soul of the Italian as expressed in pyrotechnics, or the sheen and shimmer of the silken flag; but experience has proven that these mere worldly trappings are no substitute for the virile and practical Catholicism of America.

Too great stress cannot be laid upon the essential features of religion while the non-essentials such as parades, street precessions, banners, fireworks, bands and cumbersome statues will be viewed only as the evidences of fervor. Had we more of the former and less of the latter in the treatment of the Italian question during the past fifty years there would be greater fidelity in America upon the part of the Italian and his children and fewer defections.

Despite what might be interpreted as an indictment, we can confidently say that a turning-point has been reached in Italian affairs in our country within very recent times. The restriction of immigration has contributed partially but not entirely. The grace of God is undoubtedly at work and the wholesale assimilation of the Italian and his children to American ways of thinking and acting have also had their share in the visible Church. Not the least among the factors at work in the land is the spirit of Il Duce Benito Mussolini, whose energetis personality and vigorous grasp of international affairs have

done much to strengthen the national pride and the better instincts of his countrymen in this country.

Sufficient examples have been given of Mussolini's sincere desire to stimulate the piety and religious instincts of his people in every part of the world. A few instances may not be amiss. The Italian consul of one of the largest cities in the East, some two years ago, told the writer that upon the occasion of his visit to Italy a year previous, Il Duce told him that the instructions which were given to every Ambassador representing the sovereignty of Italy and to very Consul representing the commercial interests of his Government were that they represented not only the Government but also the religion of Italy. Even more, officials of Italian societies organized in the United States whenever visiting the homeland and favored by an interview with Mussolini were questioned regarding their affiiliation or non-affiliation with the Church and were also cautioned that the safety and success of the Italian people in foreign lands depended upon their loyalty to their religion.

It must seem evident from the foregoing that the turning-point so eagerly anticipated for so many years has actually been reached and that rich possibilities of spiritual progress are imminent. A two-fold duty however rests upon the Church. There is first, an urgent need of our American-trained clergy to promote the spiritual revival of the children of Italy located in our country. Not a few will say that this is a radical suggestion. But it is for that very reason that we make it. Bishops throughout the country point with pride to the tremendous success which has attended the efforts of priests born and educated in America. The personal contact is of vast importance in the management of Italian religious affairs. Unlike the descendants of other foreigners, the Italian is not inclined to take the priest on his face value, but the diligence of that priest in the spiritual affairs of his parish, his energetic handling of disciplinary measures and the dignity with which he carries out the ceremonies of the Church soon win for him the unqualified support of those among whom his lot is cast.

The "dispenser of the mysteries of God" must bring the influence of his sacred calling within the family circle, must make himself a connecting link between the child and the Church, and by his interest in the troubles, anxieties, ambitions and even failures of his flock show himself to be a representative of Christ actuated by something higher than earthly gain. Again, he brings to his people a better knowledge of American ideals and the practices of the Church in America than one less familiar with these requisites of present-day spiritual revival.

If ever the harvest was ripe and cried for earnest workers it is today when we realize how the many forces to which the Italian responds are combined in a great renaissance of spiritual activity. We can look around the corner and see for ourselves a glorious religious prospective—if zeal, earnestness, sympathy and Christ-like charity attend our handling of this subject today.

Book Review

(When ordering books, please mention this Magzaine.)
NOTE—Reviews, when not signed, are by the Editor.

Jesus. A New Biography by *Shirley Jackson Case.* The University of Chicago Press, 1927. 453 pages, $3.00.

Back to Jesus! has been the battle-cry of critical theology for at least a quarter of a century. When Wrede first used it it meant a return from Paul to the Synoptics, from a formulated theology about Christ to the simple pattern of his God-consecrated life, from the Jesus of the creeds to the "Jesus of history." The movement thus inaugurated by no means halted at the synoptic gospels. These gospels, themselves were found to be composed of many sources. The oldest of these were thought to be Mark and Q (= Quelle), the latter being used by Matthew and Luke in common. The portions peculiar to Matthew or Luke represent later accretions, and might be called a sort of "new apocrypha." In the more primitive documents the "Jesus of history" is more correctly portrayed.

Case, of the Department of Church History of Chicago University, the author of this book, goes still further. The picture even in the oldest of documents, he thinks, is also "an artist's creation." "It has to be reduced by removing features that owe their presence to the creative impulses of the author and to be supplemented by information that had escaped the writer's notice." It is to be sure a pretentious and difficult task, at this late date, to give a more correct picture of the historical Jesus than the first Christian writers whose literary products have come down to us. But it must be undertaken, and it can be more or less successfully done by a study of the historical environment in which Jesus lived. No "return to Jesus" is adequate that is not a return to the living conditions of the time. When an author sponsors opinions that are proper more in later situations we ought to be slow to accept their historicity. All records about Jesus ought to be judged by their suitableness to the distinctive environment of Jesus.

The ancient biographies of Jesus as before us in the four gospels survived mainly because of their literary excellency and because they were supposed to be written by apostles. The latter is, however, only partially true. The apostle Matthew is not the author of the first gospel nor the apostle John of the fourth, and Luke and Mark were not apostles, though they were pupils of apostles. Synoptic criticism has shown Mark to occupy the most original position. He furnished the historical framework of Jesus' life, which was adopted by other synoptic writers. Luke and Matthew both used another source, Quelle. "The two-source hypothesis is a return to the real Jesus of history."

In the Quelle-document Jesus is the teacher. Here the religion of Jesus as taught and lived by him held the center of attention. What is outside of Quelle is a late addition, of little historical value.

When we turn to the Acts, the other book ascribed to Luke, we are disappointed in our hope to obtain new light on the life of Jesus. We hear nothing about Jesus' life and teaching. The Acts always speak of the exalted Christ, not of the earthly.

John's gospel is not accepted as a reliable historical source at all. It is a theological treatise, whose aim is to show the divinity of Christ. There is no psychological development either in the mind of Jesus or in those of the disciples. He is the lamb of God bearing the sins of the world, even in the mouth of the Baptist, in the very first chapter. He does not veil his Messiahship as he does in the other gospels, it is pronounced by his very first disciples, on the first day of their acquaintance with him.

Before our first gospels were written there was an earlier stage of oral traditions and written sources, as Luke expressly tells us in the first verse of his gospel. The difficulty to isolate the earthly figure of Jesus as caught in these original sources from later embellishments and idealizations, is great but the task must be undertaken just the same.

The author now proceeds to describe the Jewish life of the time, from which he expects so much light on the problem. Under the galling domination of Rome the "Kingdom of God" became the crucial issue of the hour. Revolution was in the air, but there were also those who counseled against it. Help would come to them only from God's direct intervention. Apocalyptic hope throve in the soil of present distress and prophetic belief. There were religious sects, exclusive and fanatical; but also a process of Hellenization. And when the gospel spread to the Gentile world, Greek ideas crept into the Christian message. The virgin birth, the idea of divine parentage, received strength from contemporary heathen cults. "Matthew and Luke (with their infancy stories) made Jesus at home in the Gentile world." The Gentile gods were heroes, doers of miraculous deeds. The same tendency began to develop in the lives of Jesus. Instead of the teacher he becomes the divine being for whom earthly limitations of any kind do not exist.

The "silent years" of Jesus' life are fully discussed. The results, however, seem to yield little. Jesus had the common man's knowledge of religion and the discipline in the practical school of real life. His life was not that of the Baptist. He lived close to Sepphoris (the later Tiberias) and was well acquainted with urban life. He was no revolutionist, he had seen the futility of opposition to Rome (in the destruction of the rebellious Sepphoris).

John the Baptist's activity brought Jesus upon the scene. John himself did not accept Jesus as Messiah (even long after Jesus' death there were disciples of John, see Acts 19, 1 ff). He was the way-preparer but outside the Christian fold.

At his baptism Jesus has a remarkable experience, a "seizure" by

the divine spirit. He begins to preach. He is largely a prophet trying to awaken repentance, purity of life, righteousness, and faith in God, although the title of prophet later seemed to his followers inadequate. As a representative of the "people of the land" (Am ha-aretz), of the ordinary Jews not belonging to religious sects, he advocates personal and spiritual religion over against ritual and institutionalism. He therefore aroused the enmity of the Pharisees and other sects. These Pharisees, according to the author, were really very well-meaning and nice people, but the later opposition of the Jews to Christianity was read back into the gospel story, and so the Pharisees came to be the bitter enemies of Jesus. "Matthew 23 (the woes upon the Pharisees) is first century Christianity's answer to Jewish opposition." We see the author's estimation of the Pharisees is largely in accord with recent Jewish apologists of Phariseeism.

What is now, the author asks, really the *religion that Jesus lived?* The early Christian writers were not concerned with Jesus' religion, they knew no psychology, knew not the varying moods of highly wrought temperaments. Jesus was to them the object of their devotions, the favored Son of God, the apocalyptic Son of man, the preexistent incarnate Logos. The Jesus of dogma and the Jesus of history were included in the Christian movement from a very early date, certainly soon after his death, perhaps even prior to his crucifixion.

Is this picture correct? asks the writer. The Logia (earliest document) contained hardly any miracles. Still a didactic and a heroic interest are manifest from the beginning. The influence of the heathen world was strongly on the side of the heroic. Asklepios, Bacchus, Serapis, Isis were all healers. "So Christianity claimed the same power for Jesus." "When Mark was written the prerogatives of the risen Christ had been generously conferred on the earthly Christ." All the gospels are overlaid with miracles that answered admirably to the demands of the mission field.

Jesus called himself indeed "the Son of God," but that is a vocational title, not one claiming divine nature. Nor does it mean the Messiah. Messiahship is an achievement of a later development. Even more often he calls himself the "Son of Man." The "Son of Man" was to the Jews the new Messianic deliverer who was to come on the day of judgment. It is highly improbable that Jesus had ever called himself the "Son of Man."

Jesus is said to have veiled his Messiahship in life, but later Christians believed he was the Messiah, and before many years passed they were able to recall supposed words to that effect. The picture of the transcendental Messiah had been no part of the religion of Jesus. He was a prophet conscious of a new and overpowering experience of God and of the obligation this laid upon him.

And *what was* then his message, *the religion he taught?* His dynamic personality and his prophet-like abandon to the cause of God were his chief characteristics. The Christians expected him to return and therefore dwelt on his official dignity. The heroic picture of his person was destined to dominate that of the teacher. The "things said

and done" by him grew to miraculous proportions. He became the ideal sermonizer as well as the wonder-worker. By the end of the first century he became institutionalized, the head of the church and of the universe.

In reality his claims were much humbler. He proclaimed the Kingdom of God, i. e., that suddenly God would come to rescue his oppressed people. It is doubtful whether he predicted the fall of Jerusalem. But the present world order to him is worthless, and a new order is at hand. God is a God of mercy, love and watchful care, but also of anger and even vindictiveness. He will soon come to judgment. While waiting for the catastrophe we must practice righteousness. The ideals Jesus inculcated were practically impossible of realization, but they will be realized when the Kingdom of God has become an established fact. He who would do the will of God must sacrifice all, even life. His own loyalty to the ideals he preached carried him to the cross on Golgatha.

Such is in brief the argument of this book. It will be seen and admitted, we think, without controversy that it does *not* present in any sense, a *New Biography* of Jesus. It is occupied from start to finish with critical matter.

And the final result is most surprisingly meager.

Jesus is a prophet who proclaims the coming judgment and exhorts his generation to prepare for it by a change of heart and true obedience to God's will. That is all, absolutely all. He is no Messiah, no Saviour, he never rose from the dead, performed no miracle. He stands no nearer to God than any other prophet. His conception of God is as faulty as that of his O. T. fellow-prophets.

And this man has conquered the world! No, this man did not conquer the world; he never could have done any such thing. Christ conquered the world with his gospel, and there is not one ounce of gospel in the whole book. We have read many lives of Jesus, but few if any that take such liberties with Him and His biographers. The writer as an historical critic doubtless shows a good deal of research, but when he is through with his criticism he is absolutely bankrupt. What is left of Jesus is so little that it hardly justifies the labors required to write such a book. Unless the writer felt in conscience bound to tell us that Christianity is after all only a great illusion.

The writer sets out by saying that it is the duty of the historian to tell us which of the many current pictures of Jesus is correct. We reply that such is *not* the duty of the historian and never can be. It is, we readily admit, the duty of the historian to give us a true picture of the world in which Jesus lived, and also of the origin of the different gospels and their mutual relation as well as their dependence on earlier sources, as far as that is possible. But a reliable estimate of the person of Jesus a historian who has no other equipment but historical research, is unable to give. Augustine says, pectus facit theologum, and it is today conceded that a theologia irregenitorum is a contradictio in adjecto. Just so is an adequate appreciation of Jesus beyond the reach of mere historical research. A man without a musical ear can-

not produce or even appreciate music. The historian without the spiritual equipment of faith will never be a reliable guide in our thoughts about Jesus. Of course by saying that we are not posing as judge about Professor Case's spiritual state. But we do mean that a man's conception of Christ will always influence his attitude on the gospels as a record of what actually happened. If a scholar does not believe in the miraculous, or the divine nature of Christ; if Christ is to him a teacher but not a saviour; if he believes in the religion of Jesus, not the religion about him: then he will treat the records according to his belief or unbelief. We see this on every page of this book. The writer reads every tendency prevalent in Bible times into the gospels. According to him if the Christian missionaries needed miracles, they read them into the life of Jesus; if they needed a heaven-born saviour they invented the infancy stories; if they needed a Messiah they—or somebody—made Jesus a Messiah from the very first day of his life (gospel of John). It is astounding with what sangfroid Prof. Case can impute the most brazen fabrications to the makers or compilers of the gospel records.

The whole attempt of the writer to get at a true historical estimate of the life and person of Jesus by research, was foredoomed to failure from the very start, for the simple reason that it was impossible to get the "ipsissima verba" of Christ or a wholly impartial account of his life from any source. All available sources are already "interpretations". Their writers were already believers and they squared their reports with their beliefs. They could not do otherwise: "they spoke as they believed." Not even the most thorough-going research can get around that fact.

Mr. Case's book will in its historical portions be read with interest and profit; as an interpretation of the life of Jesus it is an absolute fiasco.

The Eloquence of Christian Experience, by *Raymond Calkins.* The Macmillan Co.—New York, 1927. 232 pages.

It was the Reviewer of the "Christian Century" that called our attention to this book. He did us no mean service for we found in it a rich fare of spiritual meat. The title is not quite adequate; one would expect from it in the main a discussion of the effect of spiritual experience on preaching. It is not that at all; it makes experience central in every phase of the minister's life. Therefore "the position of Christian experience in the minister's life" would be a more appropriate title. But the fact that the contents were to be used for the "Yale Lectures on *Preaching*" in 1926, probably accounts for the wording used by the author.

The writer holds that the deepest demand of the human mind is that for religious certainty. The Roman Catholic finds this in an infallible church; the Anglican in an authenticated priesthood; to the Protestant a certified history is the scientific basis of Christianity. By this last statement he means that the Protestant finds the ground of

his religious certainty in the person and life of Jesus, of which the New Testament is the absolutely reliable record.

The reason that even the Protestant's position, thus expressed, is not sure, is according to Calkins that historical criticism has made many of the facts of Christ's life and many of his words doubtful. How can we rest certitude on things that are not sure from attack and perhaps, destruction. No, he says, our faith cannot be based on the historical facts of Christ's life. Historical facts in themselves have no religious values. It is for the historian to sift the facts from possibly legendary matter or later accretions. He goes so far as to even admit that the resurrection appearances might have been nothing but visions. He himself believes in the resurrection, but he does not consider it vital. The disciples came to believe that Christ's soul and spirit were alive. As though they had ever doubted that! He claims that there is no evidence in apostolic teaching that Christ's body itself was resuscitated. A strange assertion, indeed, in the face of 1 Cor. 15.

What, then, is it that gave the New Testament Christians the sense and tone of absolute certainty? It was the God-experience they received in Christ. God found them in Christ, and in Christ they found God. It was not his word or his miracles that convinced them but his spiritual influence. This influence produced in them faith, which was not a mere emotional outburst but the response of their total nature to the demands of the divine life.

If Calkins seems to yield too much to modern tendencies in the matter of the resurrection, he surprises us by taking a firm stand on the atonement. Christianity removes man from God by its emphasis on sin, and there is no other way for man to God's fellowship but by that redemption whereby God reconciled the world unto himself. Here he parts company with those who have raised the cry: back to Christ, away from Paul! He says even, the neglect of Paul is the gravest danger of our modern Christianity. Paul's preaching of the cross, i. e., that in and through Christ sin has been done away, is the central teaching of the apostles. "Pauline Christianity is primitive Christianity." We agree here fully with Calkins. Still, early apostolic teaching emphasized even more that the crucified Lord was raised from the dead, and if Calkins is so emphatic on the cross we can't understand how he can withhold his support from the resurrection, which was the father's vindication of the son and the cornerstone of the early faith. Nevertheless we are in complete accord with him when he refuses to listen to those who want us to go back to the "simple gospel" of synoptic ethics and discard Paul's teaching as so much theological ballast.

On the whole it may be said that the writer has too high an opinion of the historical critics. He says, let the critics decide which words of Christ are genuine and which are not. If we let them do that, pretty soon we should be in the slough of despond instead of on the rock of assurance. Has not Bultmann, one of the critics, told us only lately that we know hardly anything for certain about Christ's life and words. We say, again, what we said in the previous review, it is not

the function of the critic to tell us what can be believed about the words and facts of Christ's life. Not a single critic does his work without preconceived opinions. His spiritual attitude will in every case affect the position he takes on debated questions.

The author feels that himself. In speaking on the relation of Christian experience to theology, he says, "It may even be asked if pure historical criticism is possible in the case of Jesus." Yes, not only may it be asked but the question may be denied very strenuously, what e. g. may pure historical criticism say about the deity of Christ, or the Trinity? The author says these questions can only be answered by the way of spiritual experience; they play a part in a man's spiritual development; they have been found to answer spiritual needs. We may be unable to give an explanation of them that meets all objections, but perhaps only because "our intellectual comprehensions are too narrow for our spiritual necessities" (A. Balfour). Not that church whose theology is the most consistent but whose religion meets the whole moral emergency, will grow. America is not waiting for a liberalized theology with all the old Bible elements drained out of it. She is waiting for a theology that utters the realities of the New Testament experience of God in the thought forms of this modern age.

We cannot go on quoting from the closing chapters (the "Preachers" and the "Pastor") as we would like to. All the author says is grouped around his main thesis that the experience of God in Christ is the one vital requisite, etc., of the minister. No Pietist could be more insistent on the personal faith of the pastor; the whole Erlanger school could not bring the need and importance of the new birth into stronger relief.

No recent author has more consistently sought to make the spiritual equipment of the minister the conditio sine qua non. Calkins is in cordial sympathy with the recent trend towards mysticism. He even advocates certain methods of cultivating the mystical attitude. He is no obscurantist, he is also aware of the far-reaching social implications of the gospel. However, first and last and all the time, he is for a personal, thorough and growing experience of God in Christ. With this, all problems will ultimately be solved; without it, all the minister's efforts will go for nought.

The American Pulpit. A Volume of Sermons by Twenty-five of the Foremost Living American Preachers, Chosen by a Poll of All the Protestant Ministers in the United States, Nearly 25,000 of Whom Cast their Votes. Edited by Chas. Clayton Morrison, Editor "The Christian Century." The Macmillan Company. 1925. 384 pages.

It might have been better if we had reviewed this book when it came out two years ago and every one wondered what kind of sermons the men produced who, by a vote of their colleagues, had been placed at the head of their profession. Still, the book is by no means old now, and it will give its readers not only an idea of what kind of spiritual food these distinguished ministers set before their folks but also reflect

the prevailing outlook and faith of the church. The editor says that the church's mind is in a large measure the creation of its ministers by their preaching. We may receive this statement with a goodly amount of qualification; but if, as in this case, the selection of preachers was made by men "of all groups and schools of theological thought in all denominations," it seems indeed very likely that the twenty-five leaders chosen are the real interpreters of the mind of the church today.

In our review we can, of course, discuss only a few of the twenty-five, and our discussion of the few will be largely in the nature of marginal notes.

The most outstanding man of the whole group is *Dr. Cadman*, the president of the Federal Council and the pastor of Central Congregational Church, Brooklyn. He preaches a very unusual sermon from an unusual text, 1 Cor. 3: 12-13: "If any man buildeth on the foundation gold, silver, costly stones, wood, hay, stubble . . . . the day shall declare it, because it is revealed by fire." He tries to bring out the idea that believing men and women determine, by their work and character, the degree of their immortal blessedness. The hereafter is a democracy of opportunity and an aristocracy of character. One should therefore not confront the mystery of the other life without an equipment of all possible godliness in character and deed. Redemption of time, sagacious selection of material, painstaking labor from unmixed motives in its shaping and use, the cultivation of a conscience void of offense, an experimental realization of the truths we communicate—these are the lines along which the development of Christian character should proceed.

The sermon is compact with thought, original in treatment and in Cadman's characteristic style. It is not a sermon for an ordinary audience; it demands close and sustained attention.

The sermons of the book are hardly ever of an expository character. The great majority is of the topical kind and the texts used are always very brief, sometimes consisting of clauses only. *Henry Sloane Coffin*, e. g., has one on "To enter into life" (Mark 9: 43). He preaches on that an "evolutionary" sermon, showing that life in passing from the water to the earth, from plants to animals and men had to make tremendous efforts to adapt itself to changed and higher forms. What was involved in this? 1) a new breathing apparatus; 2) an improved method of motion; 3) a new protection for the body; 4) a new family and social life. Then he goes on to point out that for man to pass "from the natural to the spiritual" (the subject of the sermon) required closely parallel developments. Thereupon he elucidates the phases of this development adhering minutely to the biological changes mentioned. A "finer breathing apparatus." We "accustom ourselves to the atmosphere of the New Testament (the spirit of trust, hope and love) by frequent excursions to it and by thinking out our questions in it." And so on. We have never seen a more thoroughly evolutionary sermon than this. An audience of students may perhaps relish this; the taste of ordinary church goers would possibly be different.

But the sermon shows great homiletic skill, in addition to accurate scientific information.

Charles W. Gilkey, of the Hyde Park Baptist Church of Chicago (the University of Chicago is at the center of his parish), offers a sermon on psalm 121: 8 ("the Lord shall preserve thy going out and thy coming in"). The title is "Journeys out and home." He means the spiritual and moral adventures of the spirit of those who are not confused by creed, orthodoxy or a hallowed past; who have new visions, see new tasks and seek to live up to them in the faith of him whose fulness and adequacy are never found wanting. It is to be an Easter sermon, but the strange thing is he never even mentions the resurrection of Christ and seems to base the hope of immortality rather on the victorious nature of faith than on the historical fact of the rising of Christ, the head of the new community (cp. Peter: "He has begotten us again by the resurrection of Christ unto a living hope"). One can imagine what it would be to become acquainted with men like the ones mentioned, or with the late Russell Conwell; Geo. A. Gordon, of Boston; L. H. Hough, of Detroit; Chas. E. Jefferson; Merton L. Rice; Timothy Stone, and others; to see and hear them. Only few can have this privilege. In this book, however, you get in touch with them. You don't only hear them. Short biographical sketches tell you of their development and work. The book is an interesting one to have and to read; and doubtless the reader will know a good deal more of the "mind of the church" and the problems of the time after a thoughtful perusal of the volume.

Das Sittliche. Eine Weiterführung des Kantischen Grundgedankens von **Eduard Grimm.** Göttingen, Vandenhoek & Ruprecht 1928. 169 S., 6 Mk., geb. Mk. 7.50.

In der sittlichen Anarchie der Nachkriegszeit, wie sie in allen Ländern nur zu augenfällig ist, gilt es, eine Welt- und Lebensanschauung zu finden, die die zentrifugalen Kräfte des Menschengetriebes in ihren Kreis bannt. Der Verfasser findet dieselbe in der Kantschen Sittenlehre. Das, was dem Geschlecht unsrer Tage dringend nötig ist, ist eine Rückkehr zu dem Weisen von Königsberg. Wie das Evangelium von Christo eine stets frisch rauschende Quelle zur religiösen Erneurung der Menschheit ist, so — oder beinahe so — ist die „Kritik der praktischen Vernunft" ein noch unausgeschöpfter Born sittlicher Belebung. Verfasser denkt zwar, den Kantschen Grundgedanken „weiter geführt" zu haben, doch scheint er uns nicht wesentlich über seinen Philosophen hinausgegangen zu sein.

Kant war der erste, der das Sittliche in seiner hehren Größe und seiner unbedingten Autorität entdeckt hat. Er löst es von allen Bindungen an das bloß Nützliche oder Angenehme, sowie von allem bloß historisch Gewordenen. Er findet es in dem Busen des Menschen selbst. Dort herrscht es als ein unbedingter Imperativ. Seine Autorität entlehnt es nicht von etwas außer dem Menschen Bestehenden, auch nicht von einem göttlichen Gebot. Der Mensch vermöge seiner praktischen Vernunft, d. h. der Seite seines Wesens, die sein Verhalten und seine Gesinnung bestimmt, gibt es sich selbst. Es ist daher autonom, nicht heteronom; und weil es autonom

ist, ist es ein Gesetz der Freiheit. Der Mensch kann sich dagegen auflehnen, aber dann handelt er gegen sein eigenes Wesen, gegen sein eigenes sittliches Bewußtsein. Aus der Tatsache der Autonomie folgt die Pflicht des Gehorsams, das Bewußtsein der Verantwortlichkeit. Es gibt vor diesem Gesetz kein Entrinnen, kein Vorwenden menschlicher Schwachheit oder Unwissenheit. Es ist ein kategorischer Imperativ. Es sagt klar und unmißverständlich: Du sollst! Und weil du sollst, darum kannst du auch.

Es ist eitel, dem Ursprung dieses merkwürdigen Imperativs nachzudenken. Alles Grübeln und Forschen führt nicht weiter: Er ist ein unabweisliches, wenn auch unerklärliches, **Faktum** unsers persönlichen Lebens; das ist alles, was man drüber sagen kann. Verfasser führt dann noch aus, was für sittliche Regeln aus dem Dasein dieses sittlichen Bewußtseins sich ergeben. („Handle so, daß dein Handeln ein Maxim für alle andern werden könnte" usw.).

Auch zeigt er den Platz, den Kant der **Religion** im sittlichen Leben anweist. Aus der Tatsache, daß dasselbe hier immer mit Unvollkommenheit behaftet ist, folgert K., daß es ein Jenseits geben müsse, wo sich die Entwicklung fortsetzt. Aus der Erhabenheit der sittlichen Forderung ergibt sich, daß einmal und irgendwie das Sollen zum wirklichen Können und Sein werden muß. Und aus dem Zwiespalt zwischen Naturlauf und sittlichem Leben wird gefolgert, daß es eine Kraft gebe, welche ebenso den Naturlauf beherrsche, wie den Erfolg des sittlichen Lebens verbürge. Diese Kraft nennen wir Gott. Gott und das Sittengesetz sind wesentlich ein und dasselbe. Ihm legen wir nicht nur absolute Vollkommenheit, sondern auch die Macht bei, sittliche Würde und äußeres Schicksal in Einklang zu bringen.

Auf diese Weise gelangt Kant zum Glauben an die Unsterblichkeit des Geistes und an das Dasein Gottes. Es sind **Postulate,** die sich aus dem Sittengesetz ergeben. Man beachte, das Sittengesetz ist das ursprüngliche, absolut feststehende, alles andre tragende Faktum, die andern Dinge sind Forderungen, die wir kraft jener sittlichen Tatsache erheben.

Auf Grund dieser Erörterungen über die formale Seite des Sittlichen, schreitet Verfasser nun fort zur Betrachtung des Sittlichen nach seinem **Inhalt.** Er bespricht den Menschen an und für sich und in seinem Verhältnis zu den Mitmenschen (Gerechtigkeit, Liebe); Intuition, Streben nach Glück und das letzte Ziel. Sodann das Sittliche im sozialen Leben (wobei er merkwürdig weniges über die brennende Frage von Kapital und Arbeit zu sagen hat). Dann vom Bösen und seiner Bekämpfung. Der Böse ist das Tierische im Menschen. Er hat ursprünglich auf einer niedrigen Stufe gestanden, und das Tierische haftet ihm noch an von daher. Schließlich, im letzten Kapitel wendet er sich dem Verhältnis von Ethik und Religion zu. Er hat „absichtlich" die Religion bisher aus dem Spiel gelassen. Dennoch strebt der sittliche Mensch zu einem religiösen Glauben: 1. Weil, wenn er Gott zum Bürgen des Sittengesetzes macht, das Gesetz seines Gewissens zum obersten Weltgesetz gemacht wird und dadurch gesteigerte Würde erhält, 2. weil der Gottesglaube zu einer einheitlichen Weltanschauung führt: die Macht, die im Gewissen sich betätigt, wirkt zugleich in den Naturgewalten, 3. die Fragen von Schuld, Vergebung, Erlösung finden nur in einem persönlichen Gott ihre Beantwortung. Hier ist das weitere der Religion (theol. Ethik) zu überlassen.

Die Besprechung aller dieser so eminent praktischen Materien wird mit eindringender Schärfe geführt und in durchaus klarer, lichtvoller Sprache. Der Verfasser ist ein Jünger Kants, aber er hat den schweren Panzer Kantischer Terminologie abgelegt.

Eine gewisse Trockenheit des Tons konnte bei den sich strikt im Gebiet des Moralischen haltenden Gedankengängen des Buches kaum vermieden werden. Grimm hat das auch selbst gefühlt, daher stellt er das Wort des Apostels, 1. Kor. 15, 34: „Werdet doch einmal recht nüchtern!" als Motto und als eine Art Selbstverteidigung an die Spitze.

Was nun das Buch als ganzes anbelangt und des Verfassers Bemühen, durch eine Rückkehr zu Kant das sittliche Leben des jetzigen Geschlechts zu heben, so geben wir ohne weiteres zu, daß eine gute Portion von Kantischem Ernst ein dringendes Erfordernis der Zeit wäre. Eine andre Frage ist, ob wir solches durch das Studium Kants und auf Kants Weise erreichen würden. Für das Land und Volk, dem Rezensent angehört, muß diese Frage ohne weiteres verneint werden. Hier würde die schroffe Einseitigkeit des katagorischen Imperativs, die von Neigung, Glück, Erfolg, Nutzen geflissentlich absieht, gar kein Verständnis finden. Auch würde die soziologische Tendenz der Zeit sich nicht mit der sittlichen Forderung als einem einfachen Faktum begnügen, sondern auf ihre vielfach historisch beeinflußte Entwicklung den Finger legen. Schließlich beschäftigt sich Kants Kritik wesentlich mit der formalen Seite des Sittlichen, und wenn irgend ein Volk, dann ist es unsers, das Belehrung in konkreter, anschaulicher, lebensvoller Form begehrt, nicht in abstrakten, allgemeinen Vernunftgedanken.

Auch in Deutschland, glauben wir, wird Kants Sittenlehre nur einzelne erreichen. Diese einzelnen freilich, so könnte man sagen, können ihn dann den vielen vermitteln. Wir halten es für ein aussichtsloses Bemühen. Bei Kant ist der lebendige Nerv der Religion die Moral. Die religiösen Dinge sind nur sittliche Postulate. Gottes wird man bewußt durch eine Operation der praktischen Vernunft. Wir sind der Ueberzeugung, daß man seiner auf die Weise überhaupt nicht **bewußt** wird, man kann ihn so nur **annehmen,** postulieren. Kants Ehrfurcht, seine Anbetung gehört dem Sittengesetz, nicht dem Gott, mit dem man persönlichen Verkehr hat.

Man kann eine Ethik, eine philosophische, ohne Religion aufrichten, wie viele Beispiele zeigen, von den Stoikern bis auf unsre Tage. Den Christen kann nur eine christliche Ethik befriedigen. Er kann nur eine Ethik aufbauen mit den theologischen Voraussetzungen, die in den Artikeln des Glaubensbekenntnisses umschrieben sind. Ihm ist Christus Beispiel, Norm und Quelle des sittlichen Lebens. Ihm ist der Glaube an ihn Bürgschaft, daß der christliche Geist Gestalt gewinnen wird im persönlichen und gesellschaftlichen Leben. Darum kann er die Besprechung der Religion nicht bis auf das letzte Kapitel verschieben. Mit dieser Bemerkung wollen wir dem Verfasser nicht den christlichen Glauben absprechen. Wir sagen nur, sein Weg ist für uns nicht gangbar.

Im Ganzen, des **Volkslebens** insonderheit wird helfen weder Kraut noch Pflaster irgend welcher Art, weder antiker noch moderner Stoizismus, es hilft nur das Evangelium, nur christlicher Gottesglaube, der zu allem Wollen das Können verleiht und in aller Finsternis nicht die Hoffnung aufgibt, die sich auf Verheißung stützt.

VOLUME 56. MAY 1928. NUMBER 3.

Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America

Motto: 1. Cor. 3, 22-23.
Πάντα ὑμῶν ἐστίν, ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ.

Published bi-monthly and entered at the post office at St. Louis, Mo., as second-class matter in December, 1898.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October, 1917, authorized on July 3, 1918.

CONTENTS

Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per year (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 9807 Cudell Ave., Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-18 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

VOL. 56. ST. LOUIS, MO. MAY 1928.

THE BENEDICTION, A BLESSING OR A PRAYER?

PROFESSOR JOHN O. EVJEN, PH.D.

A young Protestant clergyman years ago related to a group of ministerial brethren how he once had made, suddenly and unexpectedly, "easy money" by pronouncing the benediction at a high school commencement in a city in the West where he was pastor. Sitting in the high school auditorium, listening to the entertainers on the platform, he was approached by the school superintendent, who asked him to ascend the platform, and after the program was rendered, to dismiss the audience by pronouncing the benediction. The clergyman consented, and—it is not wrong to say—performed. Later, being asked what his compensation was, he replied: Ten Dollars. He promptly received the money and was so proud of his fee and feat that he could boast of the incident for years afterward, as he was doing when the writer happened to hear this tale from the smiling parson himself.

Without discussing whether such an act should be severely rubricated as modern Simony or recorded as old-fashioned *subsidium charitativum,* it may be granted that fees for ritualistic acts are not always out of place. A clergyman requested to function at a funeral which he can attend only by going to considerable expense, is entitled to some reimbursement for his time, to say the least, even if thoughtless custom and ceremony decided for him that he was to "say" nothing more than the benediction. But it is poor

taste and bad ethics for a minister of the Gospel to act thoughtlessly as a mere master of ceremony or as a representative of the Aaronic priesthood at a commencement or any other similar gathering where the transactions may be psychologically, or otherwise, quite a hindrance or not conducive to the preparation needed for apprehending a religious message of any kind.

There are many high school programs where a benediction is in place; and many where it is a challenging farce, especially when it is considered religiously necessary that only a clergyman can pronounce it, and that it be made a matter of fees. Such a practice, hard by magic and commercialism, spells poor religion and poor economics for the "lay" superintendent as well as for the ordained clergyman.

Unfortunately, much confusion exists as to the matter of benedictions. It may suffice to relate one more incident, illustrative of this. A professor in the public schools, who occasionally preached, was once asked to occupy, on a Sunday, one of the pulpits in a neighboring town. No ordained man was available. His reply was significant: Being a Presbyterian he could preach, but he could not pronounce the benediction, because he was not ordained. He said, this was good Presbyterianism.

I hold no brief for the Presbyterians, but it is possible that some of them would differ with the professor. However, his reply reflects the opinion held also by many a clergyman, independent of denominational connection, whose training has fostered the sub-evangelical belief which regards a benediction as sacerdotal, thus divesting it of its essential meaning—that of prayer, a universal right and duty, not confined to men of the cloth, except, as the case may be, for good, external order.

Over against the ideas exemplified in the two incidents given above, we make the following statement, which these pages intend to confirm and present as conforming to Protestant thought: The benediction is a prayer. There is no need of a clerical technician or ordained person, to the exclusion of a layman, for pronouncing it so as to make it religiously effective. It is an intercession. Its fulfilment is subject to the conditions governing all petitional prayers, whether the petitioners or those for whom the petition is made, are lay or clergy. Expediency, good order, may dictate that a clergyman ask for the benediction, but this is not religiously necessary. It is irreligious to make the blessing merely ornamental; it is sacreligious to present it as the act of an official mediator between God and man, and to exact a tax for such a presentation, even in the form of a gift.

The Roman and Neo-Anglican View

The Roman Catholic view is the opposite of this. In the Roman Church benediction or consecration, being *sacramentalia,* instituted by the hierarchic Church with divine authority, are supposed, in their application to persons and things, to communicate *quasi ex opere operato,* through ordained priests, the grace of God, consisting in purification, supernatural revivification, and sanctification. The higher the hierarchical position of him who bestows the blessing, the more powerful it is. [1]

Essentially in unity with this teaching is Rev. William James Miller, author of *The American Church Dictionary and Cyclopedia* (1901), full of devotion to the cause of Anglican High-Churchism. He defines benediction as a "blessing such as that given at the end of Communion Office and in the Marriage Service. It is also the act of setting apart for sacred use that which is to be used in the services of the Church." He adds, that it is unbecoming to transfer from the shop to the Altar or Church articles designed for holy use without first being set apart for such purpose. A church must be consecrated; likewise new added articles must be set apart for sacred use; "and this is done by an office of Benediction. The Benediction can only be pronounced by a Bishop or a Priest." In agreement with this definition, he classifies as benediction or "Blessing of Peace," Phil. 4, 7, modified and enlarged in the Anglican service: "The peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God, and of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord: and the blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be amongst you, and remain with you always." (End of the Communion Office). He treats, in the same way, the words ending the Episcopal form of the solemnization of Matrimony; "God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Ghost bless, preserve and keep you. The Lord mercifully with his favor look upon you, and fill you with all spiritual benediction and grace: that ye may so live together in this life, that in the world to come ye may have life everlasting."

It is to be noted that the Anglican Liturgy does not always follow the letter of Scripture. It allows some latitude of diction

[1] E. Chr. Achelis, *Benediktionen,* Herzog-Hauck, P.R.E. II. The article is abbreviated in The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, II. 50 seq.

The derivation of "benediction" is selfevident: praise, say words kindly. The Greek equivalent = say well. The German "Segnen," of ecclesiastic origin, is derived from *signo crucis,* by the sign of the cross. Hence the Norwegian "signe." The Norwegian says: *Sign spis,* as the German Gesegnete *Mahlzeit*—a wish, originally, that the blessing of the cross may be upon the food; in reality, upon the partakers, by metonomy. The word "blessing" is derived from "blood," to consecrate by sprinkling with blood.

and, in this respect, follows the earlier Lutheran liturgies. It even modifies the Aaronic benediction in the form "Visitation of the Sick," adding "both now and evermore." It alters the words of 2 Cor. 13, 14 by substituting "us" for "you" and adding "evermore." This is of course in keeping with the Spirit and is as permissible as our addition of the doxology to the Lord's Prayer—all in harmony with evangelical liberty.

Rev. Mr. Miller does not say whether the last two cited passages are hierarchic benedictions. In his mind, they evidently are. And for the majority of Anglicans they can be nothing else. This Church, no longer the church of Phillipps Brooks, who had a fine appreciation of Luther, is the church of Bishop Gore, who in *Lux Mundi* defines it, in astonishing language, as "naturally of a piece with the Incarnation" thus agreeing with Walter Lock, who says the "Church continues the work of the Incarnation." Heinrich Boehmer, Leipzig Church historian, the keenest of Protestant authorities on Luther and on the Jesuits, the successor of Albert Hauck, has shown that the Episcopal Church of England is just about through with Protestantism. It has forgotten that its creed is a child of the Augsburg Confession and the Wittenberg Concordia, interpreting it in the Roman sense, as did Cardinal Newman in the days of the past. Boehmer finds that Adam Moehler's "Symbolik", whose specific ideas are, that the church continues the work of the incarnation of God, has made a great impression on the Anglicans, they, like the "Catholic Schleiermacher," wanted a national catholic Church without Ultramontanism, without a papal universal episcopacy. [2]

The Anglican Church of today, may, on the whole, be said to agree with Rome's interpretation of benedictions. But this Church has had men of conviction and scholarship who do not share the Rome-ward slant. In 1866 Rev. R. P. Blakeny issued the second edition of his remarkable work "The Book of Common Prayer in Its History and Interpretation" (London). This work, whose author has escaped the vigilancy of great theological reference works like The *Realencyclopaedie* of Herzog-Hauck, Meusel's *Kirchliches Handlexikon,* and *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart,* is a storehouse of historical information. Commenting on benedic-

[2] Heinrich Boehmer, *Die Kirche Englands und der Protestantismus, in gesammelte Aufsaetze,* 1927, pp. 96, 124 seq. It is significant that this searching analysis of the Anglican Church of the present appeared in the same year as the Swedish translation of Albert Hauck's classical series of lectures on the church historical connection between Germany and England. Both these eminent church historians found that the Church of England is rapidly steering away from Protestantism, having launched its own ship of church, characteristically as distinctive from Protestantism as are the Roman Catholic and Greek Catholic Churches.

tion in the Communion Service, Blakeny shows that the first part (Phil. 4, 7) was composed for the order of communion in 1548 and the next clause was added in 1549. Continuing he says:

"There are some who regard this formula not as a prayer, but an authoritative conveyance of blessing, and they rest their opinion on the words 'Ye shall bless the children of Israel, saying unto them: The Lord bless thee,' etc. They conclude that as the apostolic benediction (2 Cor. 13, 14) is but a Christian version of the same blessing, the minister blesses by the use of this form. We answer, that the benediction recorded in Numbers 6 is itself *a prayer,* and the priest is said to bless because he invokes a blessing upon them. Just as it is said: 'He which *converteth* the sinner from the error of his way, shall *save* a soul alive,' i. e. *instrumentally.*

"The benediction, occurring at the close of the Morning or Evening Service and Litany, is *only a prayer.* It is so called in the rubric, and the minister kneels, and includes himself. The *Peace* only occurs at the end of the communion service, and the service for the 20th of June. It can not be regarded as a more effective form, or it would not be confined to the Communion Service, and that for the accession of the Queen! Why not use it in the Morning and Evening, and other Services? It is absurd to suppose that a deacon cannot pronounce it as well as the *Apostolic form.*" (p. 429)

Rev. Mr. Blakeny opposed the Romanizing church of Dr. Pusey, the chief leader of Oxford Tractarianism, who compared the *Tracts for the Times* to the bulb and ritualism to the flower. Professor Boehmer says, the Tractarians originally had the same aim as a German group had later, in a similar situation. To this group, he says, belonged such men as Wilhelm Loehe, August Vilmar, Theodor Kliefoth, August Muenchmeyer, Julius Stahl. Now, it is well known that Loehe and Kliefoth have had a great influence upon liturgical thought in the American Lutheran Church. This fact accounts for the widespread unfamiliarity in portions of this church with the view almost universally accepted by continental Lutheran theologians: that the benediction is a prayer.

Various Forms of Benedictions

There are various forms of benediction. The oldest is the Aaronic (Numbers 6, 24-26). Much used is the *Salve,* or Salutation: "Grace to you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. 1: 7b; 1 Cor. 1: 3 etc.). Even more used is the *Vale,* sometimes called the Apostolic *Votum* or Apostolic Benediction. "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all."

In many churches it is the practice of the preacher, on leaving the pulpit, after concluding the sermon, to add the words of Phil. 4: 7 modified so as to read: "May the peace of God . . . keep your hearts," instead of using the future indicative: "The peace of God . . . shall keep your hearts," etc. All these statements are frequently called *verba solemnia,* whose literal rendering in public worship is, as practice shows, rather the exception than the rule. Professor E. Chr. Achelis of Marburg was of the opinion that they should all be expressed in the communicative instead of the distributive form ("us" instead of "you"), because the preacher prouncing them is not an Old Testament Priest, and should include himself in the congregation for which he wishes God's blessing. This is evangelical thinking,[3] quite the opposite of Romanism, Tractarianism, and Neo-Lutheranism.

Let us now treat these and other *verba solemnia* beginning with the Aaronic benediction.

I

The Aaronic Benediction

According to Dr. H. Gunkel,[4] the Aaaronic benediction wishes (1) blessing (thriving and growth) and keeping (from misfortune); (2) the shining of the divine face (that is God's favor) and his grace; (3) the kindly countenance of God and (the most universal word) peace[5]—altogether an exuberant fulness of welfare and grace. The right to pronounce this blessing was the prerogative of Aaron and his sons (Numbers 6: 23); that is, of the priests who pronounced it from the altar, with outstretched hands, after the act of sacrifice. Through this pronouncement, the name of Jahve, thrice repeated, was "put upon the children of Israel" (Numbers 6: 27), so that the name became their lot and the blessing a reality. The Old Testament view is described in the following:

Says R. Kittel: The words, "So shall they put my name upon the children of Israel" (the Aaronic Benediction, Numbers 6: 27), whatever its original meaning may have been, was essentially understood as a *wish or prayer, especially powerful when it came from the mouth of a priest.* (Herzog-Hauck, P.R.E. II. 153.)

G. Delmar is right in saying: Centuries later, when the synagogue

---

[3] E. C. Achelis, Praktische Theologie, 1912, p. 83.

In "Reformed" circles, this idea is so current, that the high school debaters' favorite "authority," Webster's Dictionary, in its definitions, includes this: "Specifically: the short prayer which closes public service; as, to give the *benediction.*"

[4] Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Second ed., vol. I, 1.

[5] Gunkel translates "Shalom" "Heil". This German word was the greeting to the soldier that he return unhurt from war, or "whole" (Hygies, in Greek). Frans Buhl in his magnificent translation of the Old Testament into Danish renders "Shalom" = "Velfaerd" (welfare or wellbeing).

was a well-established institution, it was considered that prayer in the synagogue was especially effective. It was open all day. Regular hours for prayer and worship on week days were not observed. When ten people would appear, they would read and pray, choosing a leader. If a new person would appear, he would have to wait till nine others came, when this second group would worship, after having chosen its own leader. The leaders in prayer, of the various groups, had their places before the ark and turned their backs to the congregation. Both the reader and the congregation had their faces turned toward the temple. Great emphasis was put upon the Amen of the congregation following each benediction. It would thus make the words spoken by the leader in prayer its own words.

The benediction, called the blessing of the priests, was to be bestowed by the descendants of Aaron as often as an assemblage of Israelites for worship gave opportunity. For this purpose the descendants of Aaron who were present would station themselves between the priest who led in prayer and the arc, facing the people and with hands shoulder high. The leader spoke the blessing for them, while the congregation responded with Amen at the end of each of the three parts of the blessing. Were no priest present, in ancient times the blessing was not uttered, since it was not *regarded as a part* of the *liturgy*, but was considered as a *priestly duty*. Later it became a custom that the priestly blessing should be *petitioned* by the leader. Its execution, also later, was limited to the great festivals. Not the priestly blessing, but the prayer for peace concluded prayer worship (G. Dalman, Herzog-Hauck, P.R.E. 7, 11.)

As stated, in the course of time, the custom developed that, if there was no priest in the assembly of worship, another member who was present would pray for, though not impart, the Aaronic benediction. Though it was commonly used in the synagogue, centuries passed before it was used in the Christian Church. It was not a part of the Catholic Mass, though it had been occasionally used in the pre-reformation Church (e. g. Spain).[6] It was Luther who introduced it in the Church of the Reformation.

The Applicative or Communicative Form

Luther in his *Formula Missae,* of 1523, says the *benedictio solita* might be given, or, in lieu of this, Numbers 6, 22, or Psalm 67, 1.[7] It is to be noted that he uses the communicative form "us" instead of "you".[8] This corresponds also to the spirit of Psalm 67, 1: "God be merciful unto us and bless us: and cause his face

[6] It was not used in the "Apostolic Constitutions." The statement of Loehe that the Church when blessing in the name of the resurrected One has always used the Mosaic Benediction, and that of Theodosius Harnack, that "the Christian Church has always—and properly so—retained the Aaronic blessing"—have been disproved. See G. Rietchel, Lehrbuch der Liturgik, I (1900), 286, 402. E. Chr. Achelis, Praktische Theologie (1912), 83.

[7] In the Formula Missae, Luther refers to Psalm 66. He follows the division of chapters in the Vulgate.

[8] "Benedicat nos dominus et custodiat nos, Ostendat nobis faciem suam et misereatur nostri, Convertat dominus faciem suam ad nos et det nobis pacem." See Carl Clemen, Quellenbuch zur praktischen Theologie, 1910, p. 30, based on Luthers Werke, Weimar ed. XII.

to shine upon us." R. Kittel well says,[9] that Psalm 67 is linked together with Numbers 6, 24 seq., which the priest used in blessing the assembly in the choir of Levites, continues the trend of the blessing, renders *thanks* and *prays for further blessings.* Luther later restored the use of the second person, not for theological or religious reasons, or because of any servile adherence to the letter, but because the church people of his day were too much wrapped up in traditional forms to make, with any degree of comfort, departures from the letter. Not regarding the liturgist as an Old Testament priest, he did not stress the literal rendition of the Aaronic benediction, nay rather, wrote a sermon about it, explaining what it *wished* for the people.[10]

As stated, Luther at first used the communicative form: "bless us and keep us" etc., which interpreted the benediction as a prayer. The custom, quite general in the Lutheran Church, which permits only to the ordained to use the unaltered, applicative form and obliges the young candidate for the ministry to use the communicative form, is a matter of decorum. The custom is the product of patriarchal thinking, which considered it as good pedagogy to keep the novitiate humble. It was also practiced in the synagogue, and is, from the evangelical standpoint, not mandatory. It possesses no more theological merit than the reasoning of the Age of Orthodoxy, which thought it was contrary to the will of God to carry on foreign missions. As a piece of decorum it suggests the spirit of discernment in the Age of the Enlightenment, which, in celebrating the communion, gave the bread to the nobility with the polite words "Nehmen Sie," and to the common man with the familiar "Nimm".

The pronouncing of the Aaronic benediction, whether by ordained or unordained, whether verbatim in the words of Scripture, or, more freely in the rime and rhythm of poetry, whether said or sung by one or many—is religiously immaterial. The saying of the benediction may, or may not, be, the climax in a service. To a tired audience it may actually, though it certainly should not, be an anticlimax. But in all instances it is a prayer direct or

---

[9] Kittel, Die Psalmen, 1914, 247.

[10] Concerning the first part of this benediction, Luther says: *So wuenscht nu dieser Segen dem Volk.* . . . . Concerning the second part: *So wuenscht nu dieser Segen.* Concerning the third part: *Das dritte Stueck betrifft auch das geistlich Wesen und die Seele, und ist ein Wunsch des Trostes* und *endlichen Sieges;* Again, *Denn er wuenscht nicht allein, dass* . . . . *sondern,* etc.

That the name of Jahve should be used, Luther explains by saying that God forbade the blessing of idols, as if Baal were the God. It should be the blessing of God, not of an idol, Luthers Werke, E. 36. 155 seq.

intercessory, dependent on God, the sole giver, and on the receptiveness of the auditor; or, as the case may be, on the petitioner in the pew. Certainly, the chief characteristic of it is prayer, not a ministerial bestowal and a congregational receiving. Nay, it is rather God who here "receives", and the congregation that "gives," a petition for the rich blessings of gracious God.

The Benediction Sung by the Congregation

In agreement with this idea, Bishop Jesper Svedberg (1653-1735) one of Sweden's leading hymnists, wrote one of the most beautiful closing hymns in the Church of the Scandinavian countries. It is a rendition of the Aaronic benediction, even very impressive in translation, e. g. by Norway's great hymnist. M. B. Landstad:

Herre signe du og raade
Og bevare nu os vel, etc.

The same idea underlies the singing of this blessing by the *choir,* as is the case, now and then, in the Presbyterian Church; or, though, perhaps in a less liturgical way, by the congregation's singing of "Lord, dismiss us with thy blessing" (John Fawcet) and of "May the grace of Christ our Saviour," John Newton's rendering of the apostolic benediction.

There are those who object to such paraphrases in verse, because they detract from the Word of God. But an objection of this kind makes the Word of God absolutely identical with the canonically documented word in the Old and New Testament, which, of course, are our incomparable records of God's revelation. It binds the operation of the Holy Spirit to the *form* as a sine qua non. Such an objection is little in harmony with the age of the Reformation, e. g., with Luther, who even paraphrased the Lord's Prayer for public worship; or with the main authors of the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, who paraphrased, more or less, all the *verba solemnia* in this book. In meeting the objection, there may also be some comfort in pointing to the liturgy of the Brandenburg-Nuernberg Order of 1533 by Osiander and Brentz, [11], which, barring the Visitation Articles, was more generously accepted in Germany than any other order. Beside the Aaronic benediction, this Order suggested three forms as substitutes:

"God be gracious and merciful unto us, and give his divine blessing. He cause his face to shine upon us and grant us his peace. Amen.

"Bless and keep us, God the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Amen.

---

[11] A. L. Richter, Die evang. Kirchenordnungen (1846), 208 Richard —Painter, Christian Worship. Second ed. 231 seq.

"The blessing of God the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, be with you and always abide with us all. Amen."

Views of Modern Constructive Scholarship

In confirmation of the views maintained above, testimonies may be offered from the following well-known authorities on Practical Theology,[12] especially in the field of Liturgics. Says E. Chr. Achelis: Joh. Gerhard presented the right viewpoints for the *evangelical* conception of the benediction by saying, The priests (in the Old Testament) blessed by praying for good things, God blessed by bestowing good things. Their blessing was promising, his giving. God promised that he would ratify the priestly benediction, if it was (given) according to his work and will. Consequently, as Achelis adds:

"First, It is God alone who can bless effectively; that is, can impart the divine powers of his Spirit. The evangelical Church recognizes only the powers of the Holy Spirit as supernatural forces. There is no clerical priesthood which is the carrier and possessor of divine powers and can freely dispose over them. All *human* blessing is nothing else than an *intercession* to God about imparting *his* blessing; the hearing of this intercession,—that is, the *effect* of human blessing is subject to the same divine laws as is the hearing of prayer in general. The difference between liturgical and extra-liturgical, between ecclesiastic and private blessing, is only psychological, so far as the solemn blessing of the Church, and in the name of the Church, is usually accompanied by a strong incentive for the recipient to fulfill the subjective conditions of hearing the prayer. The difference, accordingly, is never one of principle, but only gradual, dependent on circumstances.

"Secondly, only *persons* can be blessed with God's Spirit. The belief that there is a blessing of objects which make them receive supernatural power, is utterly to be rejected as belonging to the field of superstition and magic."

Another great authority of Liturgics, G. Rietschel, writes:

"It is unevangelical to conceive of the Aaronic benediction in worship as a blessing by the minister or priest, since we do not have any order of priests. The Old Testament blessing through the priesthood must not be transferred to the New Covenant. Certainly the servant of the Word who has functioned, in reciprocity with the Church, as liturgist and proclaimer of the divine Word, ultimately comes forward as the one who dismisses the congregation with an intercessory word of blessing. He does not, however, impart the blessing; nor does the Church bless through him. As a representative of the Church at large and as the called servant of the Word he prays for God's blessing for the congregation."[13]

In agreement with Achelic and Rietschel is Paul Drews:

"The great danger threatening cultic life is the fact that the cultic forms, instead of being conceived as expressions of religion, are regarded as being a part of religion itself. This holds true in the Catholic Church. But also in the evangelical field we are not secure against similar retrogressive constructions. How unevangelical are not, for

[12] E. Chr. Achelis, Lehrbuch der Praktischen Theologie, 3d ed. 1911. I, 511.

[13] G. Rietchel, Lehrbuch der Liturgik, I, 513.

example, many of our acts of consecration! How often is not the conception of the benediction a magical one?" [14]

Confirmatory of these statements of German scholars, is the statement of the Danish Church Historian, J. Oscar Andersen:

"The Reformation was in theory and practice opposed to the Catholic sacramentalia. It was strongly emphasized that the blessing of persons and objects must take place in the form of intercession, and that the mercy of God is not tied to forms or definite ecclesiastical acts. [15]

Confirmatory is also the expression of Professor Martin Schian that "the blessing has according to evangelical conception the significance of Intercession." [16]

Schian considers the blessing of confirmandi and ordinandi in the same light. "This act (blessing at confirmation), seen from the evangelical standpoint, is nothing else than an intercessory blessing: hence it is the same as the blessing of the congregation with the Aaronic benediction at every gathering for worship."

As to the laying of hands on candidates to be ordained, he says, "Of course it can only have an intercessory Character. [17] He asks whether a pastor, true to the Gospel, can use the Aaronic benediction in its original, historical meaning. [18]

Other outstanding authorities who have expressed themselves on our subject, are men like Walter Caspari and Julius Smend. Says Smend: The benediction can be nothing else than an intercession. As such, it is subject to the condition of divine fulfilment. He rejects as unevangelical all operative formularies like "I consecrate thee," "I bless thee," and he prefers a formulary as "May the blessing of God rest upon . . ." or a declarative statement like, "We declare," which is conditional. [19] Caspari, in a similar way, asserts "Blessing and consecrating belong to the field of prayer and intercession." [20]

Even sermons explicitly foster this evangelical conception. Professor Ihmels, now Bishop of the Lutheran Church of Saxony, preaching on Numbers 6, 22-27, states that to bless is the privilege and duty of every Christian. Contrasting the order of the Gospel with the special priesthood of the Old Covenant and its exclusive right to bless, he says:

"We evangelical Christians know no priest anymore. God be thanked, we do not know them any more. When the Roman Church

---

[14] Paul Drews, Article "Liturgik" in R. G. G. III, 2335.

[15] Article, "Velsignelse," Nielsen, Kirche-Leksikon for Norden 75. hefte, 1927.

[16] M. Schian, Grundriss der praktischen Theologie (1922) 203.

[17] Schian, ibid 187.

[18] Schian, Der evangelische Pfarrer der Gegenwart (1914), 103.

[19] Smend, Der evangelische Gottesdienst (1904).

[20] Article, Theologie, Praktische, P.R.E. 19, 153.

still knows and has priests, this is a relapse into Old Testament thinking. In the Old Testament, indeed, all communication between God and his people is mediated through the service of priests. The priests again and again had to reconcile God by means of their sacrifices, and at the same time, had to impart the blessing which God has for his people. We know, we have, and we desire only one priest, the Great High Priest, who, with one sacrifice, perfected all that ask for it, and who, with this one sacrifice, gained, for the church, forgiveness of sins, grace, and peace with God, forever, . . . We Know that the New Testament blessing is not a mechanical process. All blessing and being-blessed must be a *prayer*. The Lord himself wishes to do the blessing. Hence all our blessing and being-blessed *can only be prayer* . . . To bless is the function of the Christian . . . If we could only learn that all blessing must be a prayer!" [21]

To close the list of scholars quoted for expressions as to the benediction, let the name of Professor Albert Hauck be mentioned, whom Archbishop Soederblom has called the greatest Church historian that Protestantism has produced. For Hauck the benediction is "Segenswunsch" (wish for, or of, blessing), or prayer. This is brought out in the wonderful chapter, The Reformation and Public Worship, in his classical book, *Die Reformation in ihrer Wirkung auf das Leben* (1918). Nothing more elucidating has been written showing the retrogatory movement of the Church from the original belief in the general priesthood to the subevangelical institute of a sacerdotium exclusively privileged to pronounce the blessing and perform consecrations.

Summing up, these scholars clearly show what the evangelical interpretation is, and must be, in regard to the pronouncing of blessings by either a minister or a socalled layman. *Realiter* every Christian has the right and duty to "bless", where his intercession is wanted. The blessing is not a rite, without which a meeting for public worship is lacking in a zenith or climax. While entirely appropriate, and very elevating, it is not a sine qua non. And the pronouncement of it by a clergyman in preference to a layman, is a matter of long usage, of perhaps defendable decorum, but not of religious need or necessity. In either case, the effect of the pronouncement is theoretically the same.

---

[21] Ludwig Ihmels, Aufwaerts die Herzen (1918), 136 seq.

JONATHAN EDWARDS

H. J. Schick, S.T.D

An adequate appreciation of the life and works of Jonathan Edwards is based upon an understanding of the religious conditions prevalent in the American Colonies in the early eighteenth century. New England was in this period in a lax state of morals. Already thirty years after the first Puritan landing at Salem, real alarm was felt by those who had noticed the steady decline in morals. Due to the fact that the early inhabitants of New England were beset by the turmoils of wars, such as the Indian raids upon the colonies, King Philip's War, King William's War, Queen Anne's War, King George's War, and the French and Indian War, and due also to the fact that immigration tends to suppress many of the social amenities of life and to roughen and corrupt the manners and morals, the country sank to a lower and lower level. Increase Mather in 1678 said:

"The body of the rising generation is a poor, perishing, unconverted and (except the Lord pour down his spirit) undone generation." (Dexter's Congregationalism in its Literature, 476).

We note also that many of the second generation of American birth had no connection of any kind with the churches. Their children were not baptized, and the population was becoming paganized.

Hand in hand with the laxity of morals went the laxity in Christian doctrine. There was little to favor orthodox Calvinism but much to favor liberal views. The general tendency was towards rationalism and Unitarianism. This was due to the influence of the English Deists, Tindal, Woolston, Morgan, Collins and Bolingbroke, and the philosophic teachings of Hobbes, Locke, Spinoza, Leibnitz, Malebranche and others. Of remarkable influence in this regard was also a book published by Thomas Emlyn in 1702, entitled: "An Humble Inquiry into the Scripture Accounts of Jesus Christ," in which he argued that Jesus Christ is not the supreme God. The work was published in Boston as late as 1756. Another writer who exerted considerable influence was William Whiston (1667-1752), who in his work, "Primitive Christianity Revived" (1711) advocated anti-Trinitarian views. More familiarly known in New England was John Taylor of Norwich whose views of original sin and of the atonement coincide with those of the early Unitarians. A fourth influential personage was Daniel Whitby (d. 1726) whose writings are Arian in character.

The state of the churches was generally characterized as lax and indifferent in Christian life. Cold and barren religious sentiments had taken possession of many minds.

At this juncture there came into action an eminently aggressive force in the person of Jonathan Edwards. He was the fifth child of Timothy and Esther Edwards, and was born in the east parish of Windsor, now East Windsor, Oct. 5, 1703. His father was a clergyman who served as a chaplain of the Connecticut troops in a military expedition, designed for Canada, and after his return served the parish at Windsor until his death, 1758, in his 89th year. The grandfather of Jonathan Edwards was Richard Edwards, Esquire (d. 1718), a merchant, only child of William and Agnes Edwards. William Edwards was also a merchant, son of the Rev. Richard Edwards, of Welsh origin, a clergyman in London in the time of Queen Elizabeth. The mother of Jonathan Edwards was Esther Stoddard, second child of the Rev. Solomon Stoddard and Esther Mather, nee Warham, youngest child of the Rev. John Warham. The maternal great-grandfather was Anthony Stoddard, of English descent.

Due to the intellectual and moral culture of his parents, Jonathan Edwards was from early infancy influenced for a high type of intellectual and moral beauty. Their faithful religious instruction rendered him conversant with God and Christ. Their own example of consistent and devoted piety led Jonathan Edwards along the same path of loving service and faithful devotion to God and his Kingdom. In consequence of the faithful instructions and prayers of his parents, he was in several instances the subject of strong religious impressions, particulary so some years before he went to college, during a powerful revival of religion in his father's congregation.

When six years of age, Jonathan Edwards began the study of Latin, and proved himself a diligent scholar. His intellectual interests which engaged his opening mind are noteworthy. His paper on the habits of the spider, written in his childhood, reveals extraordinary talent in the study of nature. Before he was thirteen, he entered Yale College (1716) and at fourteen he was reading Locke's "Essay upon the Human Understanding," and enjoying a far higher pleasure in the perusal of its pages" than the most greedy miser finds when gathering up handfuls of silver and gold from some newly discovered treasure." While at College he was distinguished for the "uniform sobriety and the correctness of his behavior, for diligent application to his studies and for rapid and thorough attainments in learning."

Edwards brought from his studies competent learning, the matured fruits of original thinking, marked independence and entire candor of mind, exceptional acuteness and thoroughness, and chief of all the unquenched fire of native genius of a high order.

His mind possessed also in a large degree the power of spiritual intuition, characteristic of his Welsh ancestry. He seemed to behold spiritual truths by direct vision. And he was eminently a man of prayer, of intimate communion with God as his Father and Friend.

During his preparation for the ministry Edwards formulated a series of resolutions, seventy in all, They were intended to regulate his own heart and life. All were written before Edwards was twenty years of age. Let us note some of them in order that we may better understand the earnestness and sincerity of Edwards.

"(5) Resolved, Never to lose one moment of time, but to improve it in the most profitable way I possibly can.

(6) Resolved, To live with all my might, while I do live.

(7) Resolved, Never to do anything, which I should be afraid to do, if it were the last hour of my life.

(17) Resolved, That I will live so, as I shall wish I had done, when I come to die.

(20) Resolved, To maintain the strictest temperance, in eating and drinking.

(28) Resolved, To study the Scriptures so steadily, constantly, and frequently, as that I may find, and plainly perceive myself to grow in the knowledge of the same.

(37) Resolved, To enquire every night, as I am going to bed, Wherein I have been negligent,—What sin I have committed, and wherein I have denied myself; also, at the end of every week, month and year.

(42) Resolved, Frequently to renew the dedication of myself to God, which was made at my baptism, which I solemnly renewed, when I was received into the communion of the church, and which I have solemnly re-made this 12th day of January, 1723.

(43) Resolved, Never, henceforth, till I die, to act as if I were in any way my own, but entirely and altogether God's.

(70) Let there be something of benevolence, in all that I speak."—

Concerning these seventy resolutions it has been said that they are the best uninspired summary of Christian duty, the best directory to high attainments in evangelical virtue which the mind of man has hitherto been able to form.

In connection with these resolutions let us note a few excerpts from the Diary of Edwards, begun Dec. 18, 1722, when he was 19 years of age.

Wednesday, Jan. 2. Dull. I find by experience, that, let me

make Resolutions, and do what I will, with never so many inventions, it is all nothing, and to no purpose at all, without the motions of the Spirit of God—There is no dependence on myself. Our resolutions may be the highest one day, and yet the next day, we may be in a miserable dead condition, not at all like the same person who resolved. So that it is to no purpose to resolve, except we depend on the grace of God.

Saturday evening, Jan. 5.—This week I have been unhappily low in the weekly account—and what are the reasons of it?—abundance of listlessness and sloth.—It used to appear to me that I had not much sin remaining; but now I perceive that there are great remainders of sin. Where may it not bring me to, if God should leave me?

Wednesday, Jan. 9. How deceitful is my heart! I take up a strong resolution, but how soon doth it weaken.

Saturday, Jan. 12. I have been before God, and have given myself, all that I am and have to God; so that I am not in any respect my own.

Friday afternoon, June 21. I have abundant cause, O my merciful Father, to love thee ardently, and greatly, to bless and praise thee, that thou hast heard me, in my earnest request, and so hast answered my prayer for mercy, to keep me from decay and sinking.

One cannot help but marvel at the earnestness of Edwards as one glimpses in these excerpts from his Resolutions and his Diary his rigid self-examination. What a commentary also on Paul's great dissertation on the law, the flesh and the spirit, as found in Romans, chapter seven.

Edwards graduated from Yale at the age of 17 (1720), and for the next two years he resided at the college, preparing himself for the work of the ministry. He was licensed to preach in the Summer of 1722, and was placed in charge of a parish in New York. After eight months of pastoral work he returned to New Haven in September, 1723, to receive his degree of Master of Arts. He was thereupon elected as tutor in the College. His period of tutorship was one of great difficulty, due largely to the upheaval caused by the revolt of the College against the legal government, the universal insurrection of the students and the severance of the connection of Mr. Cutler, one of the tutors, with the College.

On February 15, 1727, Jonathan Edwards was ordained as a minister of the Gospel and placed over the church and congregation at Northampton, as the colleague of his grandfather, the Rev. Solomon Stoddard, who departed this life in 1729. Two years prior

to the death of Rev. Stoddard, Edwards was married at New Haven, July 28, 1727, to Miss Sarah Pierrepont, daughter of Rev. James Pierrepont, "an eminent, pious and useful minister at New Haven." She is described as a woman of wonderful beauty, sweetness, calmness and universal benevolence of mind, and of great piety. It was a union founded on high personal esteem and on a mutual affection, which increased with the years. Eleven children were born unto them.

For the first years of his pastoral work in Northampton nothing occurs that would mark his work as in any sense peculiar.

The more special work of Edwards began when in 1734 he preached a sermon on "Justification by Faith." This sermon initiated his first revival, and thus began a new epoch in American religious life. The Revival began in the Spring of 1735. According to Edwards' "Narrative:"

"The work of God, as it was carried on, and the number of true saints multiplied, soon made a glorious alteration in the town, so that in the spring and summer, anno 1735, the town seemed to be full of the presence of God. It was never so full of love, nor so full of joy, and yet so full of distress, as it was then. There were remarkable tokens of God's presence in almost every house. It was a time of joy in families on account of salvation's being brought unto them; parents rejoicing over their children as being new-born, and husbands over their wives, and wives over their husbands. The goings of God were then seen in his sanctuary. God's day was a delight, and his tabernacles were amiable. Our public assemblies were then beautiful; the congregation was alive in God's service, every one intent on the public worship, every heart eager to drink in the words of the minister as they came from his mouth; the assembly in general were from time to time in tears while the Word was preached, some weeping with sorrow and distress, others with joy and love, others with pity and concern for the souls of their neighbors. Our public praises were then greatly enlivened; God was then served in our psalmody in some measure in the beauty of holiness."

Hardly a single person, old or young, but felt concerned about eternal things. About three hundred persons were converted. In this revival Edwards preached sermons prompting his hearers to immediate action, as over against the practice of the "half-way covenant" which advocated awaiting God's time of grace. Edwards also preached boldly against the heresies of his day, assailing Arminianism which had largely taken possession of the churches.

The influence of the revival was felt in the whole region of

the Connecticut Valley, in Massachusetts and Connecticut and neighboring regions. The fame of it went abroad. After six months, however, the interest abated. Another revival followed in 1740 which continued two years. Thousands entered upon the new life. Historians estimate the number from 2500 to 50,000. During the revival the people of New England turned to the subject of religion as at no other time in the history of the country.

As the reports of the revival interest spread through the land the feelings of the people were much aroused. In public services men and women often fainted or cried out in terror. Scenes of confusion often prevailed. Schisms also resulted. The entire country was agitated. Central in the agitated scene is the calm figure of Edwards, uniting the faith and zeal of an apostle with the acuteness of a philosopher, and applying the exquisite powers of his intellect to discriminate between a divine work and its human or Satanic admixtures, and between true and spurious affections.

The question as to the value and good of the revival and whether it should be promoted or repressed, became prominent. In 1742 Edwards published "Thoughts on the Revival in New England" which was an elaborate defense of the revival. As the treatise was published before the most objectionable demonstrations appeared, Edwards was severely critized that he had not presented the entire case. Among his critics was Dr. Charles Chauncey of Boston whose work "Seasonable Thoughts on the State of Religion in New England" is a careful statement of facts collected from every part of New England. Confessedly, he aims to present the worst features of this revival in order to show the evils thereof. On the other hand the revival had its warm advocates, as is evidenced by a meeting of many pastors in Boston, July 7, 1743, who issued a statement declaring the revival a marked work of divine grace, and deploring the accounts which would discredit the revival.

In September 1743 Edwards had formed the acquaintance of David Brainerd, a missionary to the Indians. In March, 1747 Brainerd in conseqence of ill health took leave of the work in New Jersey and came into New England. Edwards invited him to make his abode in his own house. There he died October 9, 1749. Brainerd left to the care of Edwards his diary to dispose of as he thought best. Edwards decided to publish it in connection with a brief memoir of his life. The book made a profound impression. It was found in almost every country parsonage, but its influence was especially felt in the colleges, which had now become the seats of serious and religious learning.

In the Northampton parish Edwards was for many years unusually happy in the esteem and love of his people. His uniform

kindness, and that of Mrs. Edwards, had won the affection of his people, while his published works had gained for him a reputation at home and abroad. Unfortunately, however, matters changed. In 1744 Edwards estranged the youth of his parish through an endeavor to investigate the conduct of some of their number who were said to have circulated obscene and licentious literature. A considerable number of the most influential families of the town were drawn into hostility to Edwards through this affair. Later, in 1749, when Edwards voiced his opinion on the lax mode of admitting members into the church and required a more explicit profession of godliness, a great ferment in the town was raised which finally led to Edwards' dismissal in 1750. He left Northampton in sorrow of heart and gave his incomparable powers to the work of the Gospel among the Stockbridge Indians. While at Stockbridge he wrote his "Freedom of the Will" (1754), "Nature of Virtue" (1755) and "Original Sin" (1758). Enemies sought to disturb and destroy the work of the mission at Stockbridge, but they were defeated in their evil designs, and the work of the Mission flourished.

Upon the death of President Aaron Burr (1757), Edwards was called to the presidency of Princeton College, which offer Edwards after some hesitancy accepted. In January, 1758, he assumed the duties of the presidential office. As the smallpox was spreading throughout that region and had also come to Princeton, it was thought wise to inoculate Edwards (Feb. 13). For a time all went well, but a secondary fever set in and raged till it put an end to his life, March 22, 1758, in the 55th year of his age." He died with as much calmness and composure, to all appearance, as that with which one goes to sleep."—

Jonathan Edwards absorbed and embodied the best thinking of his time. Although he adopted the creed of his denomination and in a general way adhered to it through life, yet his earnest studies and researches led him to enlarge and modify some views of truth and so to introduce some changes into the current theology. He was the source of the "new divinity," in that his friends and pupils, prompted and guided by his teachings defended and advocated the scheme of doctrine which bore that name. Historically, a new period begins with him. Later New England theology, so far as it is recognized as orthodox and evangelical, points back to him as to the radiating center. The system of theology known as New England Theology, properly begins with Edwards. His freedom of thought, his philosophical principles, his religious fervor, and his anxiety to see new life infused into the churches of the country gave the impetus to that thinking which later on after

a slow development is known as the New England scheme. He effected changes in practical theology, in current metaphysical speculations and in doctrinal theology. Let us briefly note them in turn.

In practical theology he stressed the duty of immediate and energetic effort in seeking salvation. "By pressing onward and persevering," he said, "you will at last, as it were by violence, take the Kingdom of heaven." (From Sermon, "Pressing into the Kingdom of God," anno 1735). Edwards did not teach that the impenitent could save themselves, but he urged them to take such a position that the grace of God would probably reach them.

In regard to full church membership Edwards in the course of time became opposed to "Stoddardism," a practice of receiving the unregenerate to full communion, on the ground that the Lord's Supper is a converting ordinance. Edwards held that church membership required acceptance of the doctrines of grace by the heart as well as by the intellect. His views led, as we have seen, to his dismissal from his parish. As he was not permitted to preach on the subject, he resorted to the press in self-defense and published: "An Humble Inquiry into the Rules of the Word of God concerning the Qualifications requisite to a Complete Standing and Full Communion in the Visible Christian Church." (Oct. 1749). Although Edwards could not effect reinstatement for himself through this publication, yet he did much towards rescuing the churches from laxity of doctrine.

Regarding his work in current metaphysical speculations Edwards ranks high. He wrote much. However, if he could have been the editor of his own works and harmonized views taken from different standpoints, and adjusted parts of his writings the worth of his works would have been increased. He has given us his conception of the Deity in his treatise on "God's Last End in the Creation." He says the last end in the creation is God's glory. He begins with the idea that God exists in all the fullness of perfections, with a disposition to manifest his perfections. This diffusive disposition of God is the basis of the creation. In the creation God diffuses himself into outward manifestation. God's internal glory is his understanding and his will. His external glory is the emanation of his internal glory. When he communicates his excellence to men he imparts to the understanding a knowledge of himself, and to the will, holiness, which is a love of himself, and happiness, which is a joy in himself.

Regarding Virtue Edwards taught that it is "that consent, propensity and union of heart to Being in general, that is immediately exercised in a general good will." (II. p. 262) The virtue

of man is like that of God. He loved Being, when there was nothing else to love, before created things existed; man must have the same disposition. And it must be love of Being in general, for a partial love has not the perfect beauty that belongs to the love of the whole.

In Doctrinal Theology Edwards wrote upon the Will in opposition to the Arminians; and upon Original Sin in opposition to the Pelagians. His most noted work is on the Will, and is entitled: "A Careful and Strict Inquiry into the Modern Prevailing Notions of that Freedom of Will which is supposed to be essential to moral agency, virtue and vice, reward and punishment, praise and blame." It was published in 1754.

Anent Original Sin Edwards set forth his views in his work. "The Great Christian Doctrine of Original Sin defended; evidences of its truth produced." It is the last of his treatises prepared for publication and was passing through the press at the time of his death in 1758. It is directed against Pelagianism which denies the depravity of human nature. Edwards teaches that men are "either born guilty and so are chargeable with sin before they come to act for themselves, or else commit sin immediately, without the least time intervening, after they are capable of understanding their obligation to God and reflecting on themselves." (II., p. 327.) How do men become possessed of original sin? In accord with the divine constitution the race is one person and is guilty of the first transgression. The pollution of the race, which is original sin, is the extended pollution of Adam resulting from his sin at the fall. God imputes Adam's sin to each of his descendents because each is guilty. The pollution of each one is a fact, obvious to those who read our nature aright, and is the ground of the imputation of Adam's sin. The imputation is mediate, not immediate. It has a justifying reason in our corrupt nature.

In conclusion, let us briefly sum up the services Edwards rendered:

Edwards found New England morally decadent. He was instrumental in bringing about a profound spiritual change, an awakened moral sense, the joy of a new life, vigorous and fruitful. His intensely earnest sermons, his holy life and his unceasing prayers in a time of spiritual and moral depression, produced the "Great Awakening." But for this new infusion of religious life, it is doubtful whether the churches would have survived the storm and stress of the intense political and war-like agitation which came upon them and held them in its grip for more than thirty years.

Edwards found ecclestical discipline relaxed under the system of the "Half-way Covenant." He overthrew that secularizing sys-

tem, and strengthened the cords that bound earnest quickened believers into one body. Thus the insweeping tide of the secularization of the church was stemmed.

Edwards found New England un-theological. With the quickening of religious feeling and the deepening of religious conviction, theological opinions were clarified and defined. Edwards stimulated inquiry and inspired men to deepest research. A new chapter of American religious thought begins with him. His influence lived on in his disciples, Bellamy and Hopkins, continued down to the middle of the nineteenth century, and later, through different lines, ending in Emmons of Franklin, Taylor of New Haven, Finney of Oberlin, and Edwards A. Park of Andover. Verily, a man of God was Jonathan Edwards.

In the compilation of the above Life of Jonathan Edwards the writer is greatly indebted to the following sources:

Allen, A. V.—Life of Jonathan Edwards—Boston, 1889.

Bacon, L. W.—A History of American Christianity—New York, 1901.

Bancroft—History of the American Colonies.

Boardman, G. N.—A History of New England Theology—New York, 1899.

Dwight, S. E.—Life of Jonathan Edwards—New York, 1830.

Foster, F. H.—A Genetic History of the New England Theology—University of Chicago Press, 1907.

Hopkins, S.—Life of Jonathan Edwards—Sparks American Biography.

Miller, S.—Life of Jonathan Edwards.

Park, E. A.—Life of Hopkins.

Park, E. A.—Life of Emmons.

Tracy, J.—The Great Awakening.

Works of Jonathan Edwards—Published in 8 volumes, Worcester, 1809.

Works of Jonathan Edwards—Published in 10 volumes, New York, 1830.

AN ATTEMPT TO DEFINE THE RIGHT ATTITUDE TOWARD THE CONFESSIONS OF THE REFORMATION

By Rev. H. Niefer

At the Extraordinary General Conference, October, 1927, our Confessional Paragraph was under fire. The very storm-center of the heated discussion was the reference to the "Symbolical Books of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches," among which as being the most important the "Augsburg Confession and Luther's and the Heidelberg Catechism" are mentioned by name.

Quite a divergence of conflicting opinions emerged regarding this confessional statement. There was one group that advocated the elimination of all and any reference to the Confessions of the Reformation, insisting that we should simply go back to the Bible, and base our confession on Christ and the original Gospel. These dear brethren, although with good intentions, lost sight of the fact that this is an absolute impossibility. Eighteen centuries of Christian history and development lie between us and the writing of the Scriptures. Are we to believe that these centuries bequeathed to us no spiritual and religious values to be conserved and developed, that they represent a mere period of stagnation or retrogression lamentably forsaken by God? We protest most emphatically against any such insinuation. On the contrary we assert with firm conviction that these centuries were well under the guidance and supervision of God, who is the God of history, a God ever moving forward, ever surprising us with new aspects and sublime visions of His revelation in Jesus Christ. Indeed there must be an historical continuity. The eternal lines that God has written in the past must be taken up into the present and into the future, if the Church is to be a real unified and developing organism embodying and realizing an ever increasing divine purpose. If the historical continuity is given up, if the eternal values of the past are no longer conserved, we have no church any more in the true sense of the word, but only a kaleidoscopic succession of a number of petty separate church bodies without connection or interrelation; there is then no Church History any more but only a motly medley of the histories of the separate churches relating the melancholy story of their rise and downfall. Thus we are committed to the dismal theory of Spengler layed down on his "Downfall of Western Civilization" according to which there exists no longer *one, great, coherent History,* of the World as a *whole,* realizing a great increasing divine purpose, moving toward one glorious goal and being "the living garment of God," no, there exist only the somber and tragic

histories of the rise and downfall of a number of absolutely separate and independent civilizations which grow up, last for a little while, go down and make place for others. History thus has no deeper meaning. "Change and decay in all around I see."

Another group was in favor of incorporating into our Confessional Paragraph the confessions of all the great and recognized Protestant Church bodies who acknowledge Christ, the Son of God as their Redeemer. There, too, we beg to dissent. In the first place it would also involve the sacrifice of historical continuity. In the second place it would mean the giving up our ecclesiastical individuality, our continued existence as a Church, separate and distinct from others, would then no longer be justified. Furthermore, a confessional statement so broad and inclusive, indeed, would be no confession at all in the proper and recognized sense of the word. Finally it is really impossible. How could we, to cite some instances stand for and practice Infant Baptism, and at the same time, accepting the tenets of the Baptists, reject it? How can we, retaining the historical chacter and status of our church, incorporate into our Confessional Paragraph the "Apostolic Succession" of the Episcopal Church, and the doctrine of "Predestination" as propounded by the extreme Calvinistic churches? No, the inclusion of all Protestant Confessions is a veritable Utopian policy.

Although it was not voiced on the floor of the conference, we may be sure that there was a third group who said: Why should we have a Confessional Paragraph at all? Can we not do without it since genuine religion is not a theory, a rule, but a *life,* the vital things being not loyalty to confession and creeds but first hand inner experience? Did the first Christians possess a stereotyped confession or creed? Surely not. What they believed was not a formulated creed or confession, but a God-inspired passion in their hearts. Christian religion meant for them essentially fellowship with the living God revealed in Christ.

While we readily admit that genuine Christianity is essentially a life and a first-hand experience, we still maintain that especially the church as such cannot dispense with clear and definite expressions and formulations of Christian truth. It cannot get along without them else its sublime truths might evaporate into a haze of subjective religious notions and emotions. The sublime, eternal realities must be embodied in definite forms of thought, or in other words, our religious experience must be expressed in definite and distinct concepts. We need these clear concepts for our own selves in order to penetrate more deeply into Christian truth, and to appropriate it more fully; and we also need them to impart Christian truth to our fellow men. Vague, pious emotion and sentiments

and good works are not sufficient. Indeed, a real church needs creeds and confessional statements. She needs them that she might not lose sight of the important and fundamental questions and problems she has to solve; she needs them that she might not suffer from want of continuity; she needs them that it might not be left to the individual to form confessions on his own account which, in view of the perversity and lack of education of many individuals, would mean anarchy and very often scepticism; she needs them to curb license and wild speculation and hold the individual within proper bounds, she needs them to have something to start from, something to be guided by, something that constitutes the bond of Christian unity.

There is a threefold attitude that we may take toward the Confessions of the Reformation.

In the first place we may regard them as infallible and absolutely binding in every detail, imposed by a undebatable authority. We may regard them as the jurist must regard his code of laws, every paragraph of which he must accept as decisive and final whether he approves of it or not. Thus the confessions are to be accepted as a final standard, every particle of which must enter into our preaching and religious instruction whether we agree with it or not, although it is desirable that we agree with it; nevertheless this is of only secondary importance. The principal thing is that we enforce and defend the confessions in toto coelo.

Now this orthodox attitude implies that the formulation of Christian truth and doctrine at the end of the 16th century was absolutely final, the last Word of God, no longer subject to emendation or revision. The church thus becomes the mere somber guardian of an infallible orthodox creed; theology, the queen of sciences, is turned into a dreary unprogressive and unfruitful Scholasticism; the spiritual death and stagnation which blighted the Greek Church after the great period of dogmatic speculation, threatens Protestant religion. So this is an attitude we cannot approve of.

The second attitude toward the confession might be termed the attitude of *immanent correction* of the confessional statements. The term "correction" implies that there are things in them that need to be corrected. The term "immanent" implies that all corrections must be made in full harmony and correspondence with the fundamental principle upon which these confessions are based, and that they are not to be based upon any principle which is brought to bear upon them or judge them from the *outside.* According to this attitude only such corrections are admissable as do not impair or minimize the normative, authoritative and final char-

acter of the confessions. Of what nature are they? They may be of a twofold nature. In the first place they may consist in evolving theretofore unrealized possibilities and viewpoints involved in the original deposit; in the second place, since the confessions claim to be grounded on the Scriptures and since they do not want to impose anything contrary to the clear teaching of the Bible, corrections based upon a clear understanding of the doctrinal content of the Holy Writ may be permitted. But let us realize that all changes and corrections are not supposed to affect and alter in the least the so-called "fundamentals" of the confessions, an assumption which seems to us untenable.

The third attitude, which we regard as the only and possible one is what we may term the *historical-religious* attitude. This attitude is the only one which does full justice to the real character of the confessions, which are on the one side the outcome, the product of peculiar *historical conditions,* on the other side a deposit of *religious experience.* Taking this historical-religious attitude it is no longer demanded that we, children of our age, accept the confessional tenets in toto coelo, and regard them final and binding in every detail; neither shall we be satisfied with some inferior immanent changes, and the attempt to harmonize them a little more with the Bible, but we demand the right to understand and accept them as *historically-conditioned;* we reserve for us the Evangelical privilege to penetrate to what is behind the merely human and historical element, to what is their infinite background: *the experience of the living God in Christ,* the original *God-inspired intention* of the framers of the Confessions.

The historical-religious attitude holds that no confession, no creed can be final, nor that any absolute doctrine can be expressed in human words. It agrees with Bacon who says: "Words cannot match the subtility of things," and with Goethe who remarks: "The highest cannot be spoken."

Christian faith is the same in all ages, and to assert this unity of faith is the object of the confession. But this unity is one of *aim* and *spirit* rather than *intellectual content.* We must by all means penetrate to the revelation of God and the divine truths and principles of salvation, that the authors of these venerable old formulas *experienced.* In fact, he would manifest the right attitude toward the Confession who would demonstrate *why* the framers were compelled to express their faith just in *this form,* and what the divine reality and eternal truth really is that found expression just in *these formulae.* Yet, he would render the greatest service to his church who could translate the eternal truth contained in the Confessions with the same force, conviction and clarity into

the thought, language and life of today as they were translated by the venerable fathers to their generation.

Such translation would not mean a radical or intrinsical change of the confessional statements, but rather a freeing them from their own limitations and inconsistencies and the giving of a fuller life to the eternal ideas that constitute their value. In translating our creed in this spirit we would find ourselves in full agreement with the method and policy of Jesus, who took the statements concerning "righteousness" and Kingdom of God" which had a definite meaning for the churchmen of his day and gave them a new and deeper meaning, and, being charged with destroying religion, he in reality *fulfilled* it.

Now, what is required of those that attempt to translate the confessional statements into the thought, life, and language of today? In the first place they must be men of keen historical sense and thorough, comprehensive historical knowledge; for it is only in view of the historical situation which give birth to them that these Confessions can be correctly understood. In the second place they must be men of faith and profound religious convictions, men who live and move in the spirit that produced these great monuments of faith. In the third place they must be men who thoroughly understand, and intelligently interpret, and profoundly sympathize with the religious movements, problems and needs of our present age. In the fourth place the men who attempt to translate the Confession should not sit down together to formulate their own *religious* ideas and convictions, but should to the best of their ability, try merely to *voice* the religious convictions and needs of the present epoch. Let us realize that a real confession is not *made* or *manufactured,* but *born* out of the religious problems, perplexities and travails of the respective epoch.

What is then from a true Evangelical viewpoint the *nature* and *purpose* of a confessional paragraph? It is not to be a permanent, infallible and rigid test of faith, nor an instrument of ecclesiastical separation and distinction, but a bond of Christian union and a guide into fuller and deeper truth.

As to our Confessional Paragraph it might be the wisest policy not to discard it or rewrite it. It seems hazardous to break the old receptacle before the salvage of its precious content is secured. It involves a great risk to let go established values for untried theories. Instead of discarding the old Confessional Paragraph or rewriting it, more satisfaction and greater unity might be secured by preserving the original with *free interpretation* and *loyalty* to its *aim* and *spirit,* and by incorporating into our Constitution a paragraph which translates the faith of our fathers and

the aims and spirit of their confessional statements into the thought, life and language of our present age. In this paragraph we might define our confessional attitude towards the religious movements, crises, developments, problems, types of belief and needs of our present generation. But even then let us beware of setting down this paragraph as a final standard. If our Confession is not to become a fossil, it must continually be translated. In a church which is spiritually alive the confessional tenets must never become an unchanging deposit of the past, but must be ever in the *making*. The true Evangelical Christian recognizes *only one* as infallible and unchangable and that is *God*. Basing on the saying of Jesus: "There is none good, but one, that is, *God*," we say: There is none infallible, but one, that is, *the living God*.

In conclusion let us regard the Confession neither as a final standard and unchangeable deposit of the past, nor a mere fossil of days gone by, no longer of intrinsic value to us, but as a great and precious heritage of the fathers, which lays upon us the sacred duty and obligation to do what the fathers did, namely to appropriate, elaborate, and develop it, and leave to the future generations *our* monuments of faith. Let us, like true miners, delve into the mines of the past seeking and bringing to light its treasures of genuine religious gold and minting it into the coin which our age needs. Let us feel ourselves bound to our Confessions but in such a way that we live and move in them not as the prisoner in his cell, but as the free son in his father's house.

WHY GO, WHY NOT STAY?

By Peter the Hermit

This nom-de-plume is assumed so that the reader may forget the author but remember his message.

The message is, in part, comment and question to voices heard at times, most recently in the article, "Will it be Luther or Calvin?" appearing in the "Theological Magazine," Vol. 56, No. 2, Page 131 ff.

The effort to catalog the reasons so far advanced and favoring the union of our *Evangelical Synod of North America* with some other and larger religious body or denomination has produced the following more or les pertinent points.

1) We are a small denomination, hence handicapped in many ways;

2) We have had relatively small growth in number of adherents;

3) We have been conservative in number and type of enterprises;

4) Being a "Union" church, we seem to lack "individuality";

5) For the same reason, there is little "historical antecedent" or reason;

6) We have no specific, discriminating doctrines;

7) We have no specific incentive;

8) We have no exceptional educational institutions or outstanding minds;

9) We have no comprehensive or perfect scheme of organization;

10) We have no definite program of work.

Correct or incorrect, and without further study or argumentation, it seems that the above ten points are actually *"confessions."* They appear to be the confesions of an *"Insufficiency"* as deplored by some.

But a closer study of these points and of past internal synodical history seems to indicate not *"Insufficiency"* but *"inefficiency."*

If the thoughts cataloged above are based on facts, we who make the statements and we about whom these statements are made have been remiss, are remiss, and, may be, will remain remiss, even under different surroundings, in the discharge of our simplest duties as Christians and members of an organized body of Christians.

Why, then, should we go elsewhere? Why not remain and do our duty?

The author is not ready to admit that the past of our Synod

has been without some, and, perhaps, very definite profit to the Kingdom. The author admits some of the failings and shortcomings of our synodical fathers and of our present generation. The author recognizes some things left undone and others which might have been done more skillfully. The author also admits the superiority of other denominations in the various lines of ecclesiastical and theological, educational and literary effort. But the author is not blind to the limitations of the larger denominations, to their failures, and to their shortcomings. Some of these larger denominations also make "confessions" to their constituency both in private and in public. Their very "forward movement," whatever the local denominational slogan and title, are such bold "confessions."

Why go elsewhere? Why unite with those suffering pro rata from the same maladies? Why not stay at home, learn from others, and do something worth while?

For, if we go, i. e., merge with others, we will need to relinquish these things: First—the principles and reasons for our organization as a separate church body; Second—the very ideal of "unity" between two great discordant church bodies, and, becoming a part of one of these two discordant bodies, will need to promote discord instead of unity; Third—the very principle of the "Evangel" or Gospel of Jesus Christ by emphasizing the dictum of some leader,

The author is not unmindful of the fact that similar arguments, perhaps in varied forms, have been introduced otherwise when new alliances and mergers of church bodies were being effected. They may seem platitudes to some. The subject of church and denominational mergers has been most interesting to the author. He has seen and heard much pro and con, has witnessed conflict, experimentation, success and failure, also the heroic struggle of some who would not merge when ordered to do so by their erstwhile superiors. One question will not down, Why merge? Why go; why not stay and do a bit of constructive work of your own for the Christ and His Kingdom?

Honestly, Brethren, must we go? Is there no reason for remaining what we are and overcoming the very things we charge ourselves with? We had an opportunity to make a bold stroke when our constitution was undergoing repairs. We could have recast the present and the future into an efficient labor for the Lord of the church. Time and again suggestions have been offered and considered but without aggressive effort and active cooperation. Sometimes it has been our conservatism which held us back, sometimes the fear to undertake something new, and sometimes something worse than fear!

Why go? Why not remain and do something?

Die konfessionelle lutherische Theologie.

Von Professor Dr. R. H. Grützmacher.

Die neuere lutherische Theologie wurzelt in einem Aufblühen des religiösen Lebens, der Erweckungsbewegung, die mit ihrem Gewichtlegen auf Sünde und Gnade die Grundelemente der urchristlichen und reformatorischen Erlösungsreligion wieder belebte und in sittlicher Hinsicht die Aktivität hauptsächlich auf das Reich Gottes richtet. Diese religiösen Erlebnisse waren zunächst unabhängig von den Urkunden und Aussagen der lutherischen Kirche und sonderlich von ihren Bekenntnisschriften gemacht. Der Ausgangspunkt war ein subjektiv unmittelbarer, nicht ein objektiv überlieferter. Aber einzelne Männer haben bewußt zur Reformation zurückgelenkt und die subjektive Erneuerung des religiösen Lebens mit dem objektiven Gehalt der Reformation verbunden. In stärkster Ablehnung des Rationalismus ist dies in den berühmten 95 Thesen von Claus Harms, einem Kieler Prediger, 1817 geschehen. Dieses innerliche Hineinwachsen in das objektive Luthertum haben besonders auch die Begründer der Erlanger Theologie Harleß und Thomasius geschildert. Sie erklären: Wir waren längst Lutheraner, ehe wir es wußten. Wir erfuhren mit Rührung, daß der Gehalt unsers persönlichen Erlebens zugleich der Inhalt des lutherischen Bekenntnisses sei. So ging der Weg nicht vom objektiven Bekenntnis zur Religion, sondern von der subjektiven Religiosität zum Bekenntnis als Zeugnis des eigenen Erlebens, welches man wesentlich ebenso formuliert hätte, wie es schon die Väter getan hatten. Diese Verbindung mit den objektiven Schöpfungen der Reformation beschränkte sich nicht auf die Bekenntnisschriften, sondern bezog sich ebenso auf Luthers Werke, auf die Erbauungs- und Gesangbücher, auf die liturgischen Formeln und kirchlichen Ordnungen. Das Subjektive verband sich mit dem Objektiven, das Persönliche mit dem Allgemeinen.

Die Lutherische Kirche begann wieder lebendig zu werden. Praxis und Theorie konzentrierten ihr gesamtes Interesse auf die Kirche. Man suchte ihre äußere Ordnung wieder aufzubauen, besonders ihr Gottesdienstliches Leben durch Rückkehr zu den alten Liturgien und Gesangbüchern. Aber auch die Rechtsordnung der Kirche suchte man nach innen wie nach außen wieder herzustellen. Bekenntnisverpflichtung wurde wieder eingeführt. Vor allem aber handelt es sich um eine Neuordnung des Verhältnisses von Kirche und Staat und zwar in der Richtung auf eine größere Selbständigkeit der Kirche. Eine der ersten wissenschaftlichen Zeitschriften des erneuerten Luthertums trägt den Titel: Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche, der kurz dahin erläutert wurde: „Wir wollen keinen Protestantismus ohne Kirche, aber auch keine Kirche ohne Protestantismus.“

I.

Die lutherische Repristinationstheologie.

Auf Grund dieser religiösen Bewegung und des kirchlichen Neubaus erhob sich eine lutherische Theologie, um diese Tatbestände in wissenschaftlicher Form darzustellen. Innerhalb ihrer entstanden zwei Haupttypen, die man kurz also die Repristinationstheologie und als die Erlanger lutherische Theologie bezeichnen kann. Die erstere wollte im Wesentlichen das in der Zeit des Rationalismus und der Aufklärung verschüttete **religiöse und kirchliche Gut auch in den wissenschaftlichen Formen der lutherischen Theologie des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts wieder aufleben lassen.** Dieses Ziel spricht besonders deutlich aus der Marburger Professor **Vilmar** (1800—1868) in seiner Schrift: „Die Theologie der Tatsachen wider die Theologie der Rethorik" (1856). „Die Theologie soll wissen, daß sie nichts Neues zu sagen, nichts Neues zu entdecken habe, daß vielmehr ihre Aufgabe nur die sei, das in der Heiligen Schrift niedergelegte, von der Kirche aufgenommene Seeligkeitsgut zu bewahren und so an die künftigen Diener der Kirche zu überliefern, daß dieselben in den vollständigen, unverkürzten, sichern, handlichen und möglichst leichtesten Besitz dieses Gutes gelangen." Die Forderung Vilmars war im Grund nur die Anwendung des Programms der Romantik auf die Theologie und somit auch nicht unabhängig von einer allgemeinen geistigen Zeitströmung. Wie man im Katholizismus im Mittelalter alles Licht sah und darum zu ihm zurückkehrte, wie man sich auf nationalem Gebiet den älteren nationalen Literaturschöpfungen zuwandte, wie man im Recht das geschichtlich gewordene Recht bevorzugte, so sollte auch die lutherische Theologie zu den von den Vätern ererbten Gut zurückkehren, es nur bewahren und weiter überliefern, damit es für die kommende Generation möglichst bequem und leicht zu besitzen wäre.

Dieses Programm wurde auf den verschiedensten Gebieten der christlichen Theologie durchzuführen versucht, zunächst in den biblischen Disziplinen und hier wieder beim **Alten Testament.** Die letztere Aufgabe leistete in den Jahren von 1830—1870 mit einer Reihe von Schülern **E. W. Hengstenberg.** Er trat für die Echtheit aller biblischen Schriften im Sinn der kirchlichen, beziehungsweise der Rabbinischen Tradition ein, so für die Abfassung der fünf Bücher des Pentateuch durch Moses, des Hohen Liedes durch Salomo; sodann erschien das ganze Alte Testament als eine Weissagung, die schon alle wesentlichen christlichen Hauptgedanken enthält wie etwa die Zweinaturenlehre Christi. Dies war nur möglich durch eine stark allegorisch-spiritualistische Exegese. Die Behandlung des **Neuen Testaments** in der Repristinationstheologie war die gleiche. Auf den Nachweis der Echtheit und Authentizität im Sinn der Ueberlieferung wurde das größte Gewicht gelegt. Biblisch-theologisch an-

gesehen sollte das Neue Testament wesentlich schon die ausgeführten Kirchenlehre zum Beispiel über die Dreieinigkeit enthalten. Die neutestamentliche Weissagung sollte die gesamte kirchengeschichtliche Entwicklung schon voraussagen.

Diese in den biblischen Disziplinen durchgeführte Stellung zur Bibel wurde auch die Grundlage ihrer dogmatischen Auffassung und des aus ihr zu entnehmenden Systems der christlichen Lehre. Als Hauptvertreter dieser **Repristinationsdogmatik** ist **Philippi** (1809—1832), der eine ausführliche „Kirchliche Glaubenslehre" veröffentlichte, die in weitesten Kreisen Verbreitung fand, zu nennen. Diese Glaubenslehre sucht die Gedanken der altlutherischen Dogmatik unter scharfem Abweis aller inzwischen aufgetretenen Einwände möglichst getreu zu reproduzieren. In der Bestimmung der systematischen Theologie nennt er zwar als Quelle „das erfahrungsmäßige Bewußtsein des gläubigen Subjektes." Im Grund aber ist etwas anders die maßgebende Quelle: „Die Quelle, aus der die Dogmatik zu schöpfen hat, ist die durch die Offenbarung erleuchtete Vernunft des dogmatisierenden Subjektes." Infolgedessen bietet er am Anfang seiner Glaubenslehre die Lehre von der irrtumslosen inspirierten **Schrift,** wenn er auch in Rücksicht auf den Textbestand nicht mehr von Wörtern, sondern nur von Wortinspiration reden will. „Mit Recht behaupteten die Alten nicht nur eine Real-, sondern auch die Verbalinspiration. Die Apostel und Propheten, ganz eingetaucht, lebend und webend im Element des göttlichen Geistes, konnten auch nur völlig durchgeistete Worte reden. Indem wir aber die Wortinspiration der Heiligen Schrift verteidigen, wollen wir damit nicht einer Wörterinspiration das Wort reden. Nicht die einzelnen Buchstaben, Silben und Wörter, auch losgelöst vom Inhalt und Zusammenhang, sind als unmittelbar eingegeben oder als von außen her diktiert zu betrachten, denn die Schrift enthält nicht Wörter Gottes, sondern das Wort Gottes und die göttliche Vorsehung hätte dann nicht zulassen dürfen, daß im Lauf der Zeit diese geheiligten Wörter in verschiedenen Lesarten auf die Nachwelt kamen." Nicht minder vertrat Philippi die Lehre von der **Person Christi** genau in der altkirchlich altprotestantischen Formulierung bis zur Anhypostasie der menschlichen Natur Christi. Mit besondrer Wucht trat er später in einem Streit mit dem Erlanger Hofmann für die altprotestantische Form der **Versöhnungs- und Rechtfertigungslehre** ein, weil er meinte, daß nur in ihr das spezifisch lutherische Grunderlebnis der **Rechtfertigung,** das ihn, den früheren Juden, zum Christen gemacht hatte, geborgen sei: „Denn gerade um der lutherischen Versöhnungs- und Rechtfertigungslehre willen in ihrer bekenntnismäßigen Form und Fassung bin ich lutherischer Theologe, lutherischer Christ, ja Christ überhaupt. Denn wer mir das dem Zorn Gottes als Lösegeld gezahlte

Sühnblut des Sohnes Gottes, die der Strafgerechtigkeit Gottes geleistete stellvertretende Genugtuung unsers Herrn und Heilands Jesu Christi und damit die Rechtfertigung und Sündenvergebung allein durch den Glauben an das Verdienst dieses meines Bürgen und Mittlers, die Zurechnung der Gerechtigkeit Jesu Christi nimmt, der nimmt mir das Christentum überhaupt. Ich wäre dann ebenso gern bei der Religion meiner Väter des Samens Abrahams nach dem Fleisch geblieben." — **Philippi reproduziert hiermit nicht nur den religiösen und kirchlichen, sondern auch den theologischen wissenschaftlichen Typus des Altprotestantismus, nicht nur den alten Inhalt, sondern auch die alte Form.**

II.

Die Erlanger Theologie.

Auch die Erlanger Theologie wurzelt in der gleichen religiösen Erweckungsbewegung und der durch diese wiederbelebten urchristlich-reformatorischen Erlösungsreligion. Auch für sie sind demnach Sünde, Gnade, der Versöhner Jesus Christus Lebenswerte. Auch in ihr herrscht ein eschatologisches Sehnen und der kräftige Wille zur Reichsgottesarbeit. Auch sie will durchaus kirchlich sein. Aber in der Auffassung des **Wesens der Kirche** macht sich ein prinzipieller Dissensus zwischen ihr und der Repristinationstheologie geltend, über den besonders in den fünfziger und sechziger Jahren des 19. Jahrhunderts lebhaft gestritten worden ist. Den Erlanger Standpunkt vertrat zunächst der praktische Theologe **Höfling** in einer erstmalig 1850 erschienenen Schrift: „Grundsätze evangelisch-lutherischer Kirchenverfassung." Positiv stellt Höfling fest: Das Wesen des protestantischen Kirchenbegriffes verbietet die Aufnahme aller äußeren rechtlichen Formen in das Wesen der wahren Kirche. Diese ist vielmehr nur Sammlung der Gläubigen und sammelnde Anstalt für den Gläubigen, zu deren Organen die Gnadenmittel und das mit und in diesen gesetzte Amt der Gnadenmittel gehört.

Ein weiteres und noch bedeutsameres Charakteristikum der Erlanger Theologie liegt in ihrem **Verhältnis zur Wissenschaft und in ihren Beziehungen zum neueren Geistesleben.** Sie erstrebt bewußt ein neues wissenschaftliches Verständnis des Christentums entsprechend Hofmanns berühmter Forderung nach einer **„neuen Weise alte Wahrheit zu lehren."** Das Verhältnis zur älteren Lutherischen Theologie des 17. Jahrhunderts und damit auch zur Repristinationstheologie des 19. Jahrhunderts, zum modernen Fortschritt anderseits hat Thomasius in klassischer Form zum Ausdruck gebracht. „Vorwärts haben wir gewollt auf allen Gebieten der Theologie, nur keinen solchen Fortschritt, der die alten Grundvesten erst abbricht, keinen solchen, der lediglich in der Luft schwebt, sondern einen Fortschritt auf dem alten guten Grund, einen organischen Fortschritt."

Der innertheologische Fortschritt der Erlanger Theologie ist in seiner wissenschaftlichen Formulierung bedingt durch den Zusammenhang mit dem allgemeinen Geistesleben. Sie hat Beziehungen gewonnen zur Psychologie, zur Geschichte und zur spekulativen Philosophie und zwar vornehmlich derjenigen des späteren Schelling, aber auch Hegels.

Die subjektiv psychologische Grundlegung der Theologie hat ihre schärfste Formulierung in **Hofmanns** berühmtem Satz gefunden: **„Ich der Christ bin mir dem Theologen eigenster Gegenstand meiner Wissenschaft."** Der persönliche Christenstand bietet danach der Theologie den Stoff der Wissenschaft, diese ist scharf gesprochen Selbstbiographie. Hofmann sagt an einer Stelle deutlich, das Christentum habe zum ersten ein unabhängiges Dasein in dem unmittelbar gewissen Tatbestand der Wiedergeburt. Aus ihm entnimmt Hofmann selbständig das Lehrganze, das er im „Schriftbeweis" an den Anfang stellt. Die christliche Psychologie ist mithin eine entscheidende Grundlage für Hofmanns Theologie. **Frank** entnimmt das Thema seines größten und selbständigsten Werkes **„System der christlichen Gewißheit"** (1. Auflage 1870 ff., 2. Auflage 1881 ff.) dem Wesen der reformatorischen Religiosität, die nur kraft ihres subjektiven, wenn auch in Gott gebundenen, Gewissens den Bruch mit der objektiven Autorität der römischen Kirche unternahm. Aber er beruft sich für den subjektiven Ausgangspunkt auch auf die parallele Stellungsnahme der gesamten modernen Philosophie von Cartesius bis Kant und auf den Empirismus der modernen Naturwissenschaft, die aus den beobachteten Wirkungen auf das objektiv Wirksame zurückschließt. **Ausgangspunkt für die Erlanger Theologie ist das subjektive Christenleben sowohl bei Hofmann wie bei Frank.**

Frank geht von einer allgemein-psychologisch erkenntnistheoretischen Bestimmung des **Wesens der Gewißheit** aus und beschreibt ihr formales Zustandekommen. „Die Gewißheit ist das Innewerden der Uebereinstimmung des Seins mit dem Begriff oder der Erfahrung mit der Erkenntnis." Die Gewißheit ist eine Zuständlichkeit des Subjektes, die aber zugleich sich auf ein Objekt bezieht. Die Verbindung zwischen Subjekt und Objekt kommt durch Erfahrung zustande. Erfahrung besteht in der bewußten und dauernden Aufnahme und Verarbeitung von Eindrücken, die ein Subjekt von einem Objekt hat. Die christliche Gewißheit trägt formal den gleichen Charakter. Materiell unterscheidet sich die christliche Gewißheit von der natürlichen durch die sonderliche sittliche Erfahrung, welche ihr zu Grunde liegt. Sie besteht in der **Wiedergeburt** und **Bekehrung**. Frank versteht darunter „eine durch ethische, nicht von dem Subjekt selbst ausgehende, aber von ihm willig hingenommene Impulse vollzogene Umwandlung des sittlichen Lebenstandes. Ver-

möge ihrer unterscheidet sich ein neues Ich als innerster Bestimmungsgrund des persönlich-sittlichen Lebens von dem bisher herrschenden und behauptet im Kampf mit demselben seine zentrale dominierende Stellung." **Der letzte Grund der christlichen Gewißheit ist für Frank der Tatbestand der sittlichen Erneuerung.** Das Vorhandensein des guten Baumes gibt sowohl die Gewißheit, daß er gut ist, wie daß ihm gute Wurzeln zu Grunde liegen.

Denn aus dieser grundlegenden Gewißheit von der Wiedergeburt und Erfahrung gewinnt Frank die Gewißheit um alle für die christliche Erlösungsreligion wichtigen Wahrheiten. „Im Subjektiven ist zugleich die Gewißheit vom Objektiven enthalten." Infolgedessen ist der weitere Inhalt des Systems dem Nachweis gewidmet, welche **Glaubensobjekte** dem Christentum in und durch die Erfahrung der Wiederkunft vergewissert worden sind. Frank unterscheidet in Bezug auf die Gewißheit drei Arten von Glaubensobjekten, die er immanente, transzendente und transeunte nennt. Immanente Objekte sind die unmittelbar im Subjekt enthaltenen Erkenntnisse über die Wiedergeburt, aber auch über die Sünde und Freiheit. Von diesem steigt er zu den wirkenden transzendenten Faktoren auf: Gott, seine Persönlichkeit und die Dreieinigkeit, wie der Gottmensch und sein Sühnewerk. Die transeunten Glaubensobjekte sind diejenigen, durch welche jene transzendenten Faktoren hindurchgehen, um die Verbindung mit den immanenten Tatbeständen des christlichen Lebens herstellen. Hierher gehören die Kirche, die Gnadenmittel und auch die Schrift.

Vom Standpunkt der christlichen Gewißheit aus vollzieht Frank auch eine **apologetische Auseinandersetzung** mit den das Christentum bestreitenden Weltanschauungen. Er hält eine Apologetik im Sinn einer voraussetzungslosen allgemeinen gültigen Auseinandersetzung mit antichristlichen Weltanschauungen für erfolglos. Er will statt dessen nur zeigen, warum einen Christen, wenn er wirklich ein Christ ist, diese Gegensätze nicht zu beunruhigen brauchen, ja ihm im Gegenteil notwendig erscheinen. Erlebt man selbst kein Wunder, so muß man Rationalist sein, erfährt man nicht die kräftigende Wirkung des Wortes Gottes, so muß man dieses kritisch zersetzen, erfaßt man nicht persönlich den Gegensatz des heiligen Gottes wider die Sünde, so muß man Gott pantheistisch mit der Welt verbinden.

Franks System ist eine wirklich grandiose selbständige Leistung, in der eine neue Weise, die alte Wahrheit zu begründen versucht wird. Vom Standpunkt der alten Wahrheit kann man inhaltlich kein Bedenken erheben. Fragen kann man nur, ob wirklich der von Frank gewählte neue Weg der richtige und auf die Dauer gangbar ist.

Solche Bedenken hat **Ihmels** (geb. 1858) geltend gemacht

in seinem Buch „Die christliche Wahrheitsgewißheit, ihr letzter Grund und ihre Entstehung" (1. Auflage 1901, 3. Auflage 1914). Ihmels ist zunächst mit Frank darin einig, daß der letzte Grund, welcher den Christen der Wahrheit gewiß macht, ein subjektiver ist: „Sie kann nur auf dem Weg persönlicher Heilserfahrung zu Stande kommen." Die Frage ist aber nun die, ob ich aus dieser subjektiven Erfahrung auch die Erkenntnis des objektiven Christentums ableiten kann, oder ob mir dieses nicht zunächst anderswoher gegeben sein muß, damit ich daran dann meine subjektiven Erfahrungen anschließe. Dieser Meinung ist Ihmels. Es ist das göttliche Wort mit seinem zentralen Inhalt, das dem Christen geschichtlich bekannt wird und seine Wirkung an ihm ausübt. An diese objektiven Erkenntnisse schließt sich erst die persönliche Erfahrung an, welche den Christen der Schrift gewiß macht. **So führt hier der Weg vom Objektiven zum Subjektiven, von der Geschichte zur Psychologie.** Ein weiterer Unterschied zwischen Frank und Ihmels besteht in der näheren Bestimmung der grundlegenden religiösen Erfahrung. Während Frank sie wesentlich als sittliche bezeichnete und sie Wiedergeburt und Erfahrung nannte, nennt sie Ihmels die **Rechtfertigung**: „Immerhin wird es zuletzt eine doppelte Reihe von Eindrücken sein, an denen das Verständnis und die Gewißheit des Evangeliums haftet. Einmal hat das Evangelium das Recht der göttlichen Forderungen an uns und des göttlichen Gerichtes über unsre Sünde bestätigt. Wie aber dann aus der Heilserfahrung, welche unter allen Umständen schon in der Gerichtserfahrung sich verbarg, unter fortgehender Einwirkung dieses Evangeliums die sieghafte Glaubensgewißheit um dasselbe als das ihn rettende Gotteswort geworden ist, ist vollends das unübertragbare Geheimnis einer jeden Person, die es erlebt."

Die Eigentümlichkeit der Erlanger Theologie ist weiter charakterisiert durch ihre Stellung zur Geschichte; nennt man sie doch geradezu die **Heilsgeschichtliche Theologie.** Damit tritt sie in Gegensatz zu der altlutherischen und auch zur Repristinationstheologie, für welche die Offenbarung zu allen Zeiten einen sich wesentlich gleichbleibenden Inhalt supranaturaler Erkenntnisse hatte. Demgegenüber entwickelt die Erlanger Theologie eine heilsgeschichtliche Auffassung der Offenbarung und zwar gerade auch in Bezug auf das Verhältnis von Weissagung und Erfüllung.

In allen Wissenschaften trat in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts das Historische neben, ja über das Rationale in den Vordergrund. Das zeigte sich in der Rechtsgeschichte, in der Staatengeschichte und in der Philologie. Selbst die Naturwissenschaft beugte sich dem historischen Prinzip, indem sie vor allen Dingen fragte, wie die Natur einst gewesen sei und wie der gegenwärtige Zustand allmählich geworden wäre. Das 19. Jahrhundert wird darum auch

das Jahrhundert der Geschichte. Von ihm wird auch die Erlanger Theologie beeinflußt. Aber auch die **Verbindung von Geschichte und Metaphysik,** ja die Bildung des Begriffes der Heilsgeschichte ist schon außerhalb der Theologie vollzogen von dem **Philosophen Schelling** in der letzten Periode seines Denkens, in der er einen ganz unmittelbaren Einfluß auf den Begründer der heilsgeschichtlichen Theologie, Hofmann, ausübte.

Bei Schelling finden sich die für die gesamte heilsgeschichtliche lutherische Theologie maßgebenden Sätze: „Der Inhalt der Offenbarung ist nichts anders als eine höhere Geschichte, die bis zum Anfang der Dinge zurück und bis zu deren Ende hinausgeht." Die Theologie hat es ganz und gar mit Geschichte zu tun, denn „das Christentum ist unmittelbar und zunächst eine Tatsache, die wie jede andre rein geschichtlich ausgemittelt werden muß." Christus selbst ist eine geschichtliche Erscheinung, aber doch eine solche, in der sich das Ewige offenbart: „Der eigentliche Inhalt des Christentums ist aber ganz allein die Person Christi. Christus ist nicht der Lehrer, Christus nicht der Stifter, er ist der Inhalt des Christentums." „Wer von einer übergeschichtlichen Geschichte nichts weiß, hat keinen Raum, wohin er eine Persönlichkeit wie Christum stellen könnte." In diesen Formeln: **höhere Geschichte, übergeschichtliche Geschichte ist der Begriff der Heilsgeschichte schon gegeben.**

Die Nachwirkungen Schellings machen sich besonders in **Hofmanns** erstem großem Werk: **„Weissagung und Erfüllung im Alten und im Neuen Testament"** (1841—1844) geltend. Die Weissagung vollzieht sich nicht in erster Linie in Worten, sondern in Tatsachen und deren Zusammenhang, die nachträglich durch das Wort gedeutet werden. Die israelitische Geschichte ist ein Zusammenhang von Tatsachen, die auf ein bestimmtes Ziel, Christus, hinstreben. „In dem heiligen und seeligen Menschen Jesus ist die Geschichte, welche zwischen Gott und Menschen geschieht, zu einem vorläufigen Abschluß gekommen." Christi Geschichte selbst ist aber wieder der Ausgangspunkt einer weiteren Geschichte, die eine Weissagung auf die Vollendung des Verhältnisses von Gott und Menschheit in sich schließt. „Sonach haben wir in der Selbstdarstellung Christi in der Welt zugleich Geschichte und Weissagung: Geschichte nämlich immer fortschreitende Gestaltung der Gemeinschaft von Gott und Mensch; Weissagung, nämlich immer bestimmtere Hinweisung auf die endliche Gestalt der Gemeinschaft von Gott und Mensch."

Diese Auffassung der Geschichte, die auf allen ihren Stufen einschließlich der neutestamentlichen Weissagung ist, als einer in sich zusammenhängenden christlichen Heilsgeschichte, hat **Hofmann** auch seinem zweiten großen Werk: **„Der Schriftbeweis. Ein theologischer Versuch"** (1. Auflage 1852 ff., 2. Auflage 1857 ff.) zugrunde gelegt. Das Christentum ist einmal ein Tatbestand, der sich

aus dem religiösen Leben des einzelnen Christen entnehmen läßt. Davon war schon früher die Rede. Sodann aber liegt das Christentum in der Heilsgeschichte vor, die von der Gegenwart nach rückwärts bis in die Ewigkeit hinaufführt und nach vorwärts in der Eschatologie endet. Infolgedessen schildert Hofmann in seinem „Schriftbeweis" jeden einzelnen Grundbestandteil der christlichen Wahrheit in seiner heilsgeschichtlichen Entwicklung von den Anfängen an über Christus bis zum Ende aller Dinge. Er stellt zum Beispiel alle die Tatsachen dar, durch die sich Gott im Alten Bund mit den Menschen verknüpft hat, bis in Christus die engste gottmenschliche Verbundenheit erreicht wird, die sich in der Gemeinde fortsetzt und durch den wiederkehrenden Christus vollendet wird.

Auf Grund und im Anschluß an diese heilsgeschichtliche Auffassung der Offenbarung entwickelt sich die Erlanger **Lehre von der heiligen Schrift,** die trotz gewisser Zusammenhänge mit der altlutherischen und der Repristinationstheologie prinzipiell Neues in sich schließt. Die eigentliche Offenbarung vollzieht sich in Geschichtstatsachen, die ihre Deutung im mündlichen, inspirierten, prophetischen Wort finden. Erst die Wiedergabe dieser Offenbarungstatsachen und Worte ist die Schrift. Hofmann nennt die Schrift „Denkmal und Urkunde der Heilsgeschichte." Sie ist der Abschluß sowohl der alt- wie der neutestamentlichen Offenbarungsgeschichte. Für Hofmann sind Schrift und Offenbarung nicht identisch, aber sie stehen einander auch nicht feindlich oder wenigstens beziehungslos gegenüber. **Die Schrift ist Abschluß und Wirkung der Heilsgeschichte.**

Aus diesem Schriftverständnis erwachsen für Hofmann zwei neue Probleme, die in dem Titel seiner beiden Werke zum Ausdruck kommen in „Schriftbeweis" und in „Die heilige Schrift Neuen Testaments zusammenhängend untersucht" (1862 ff.). In der ersten Schrift wendet sich Hofmann gegen den in der altdogmatischen und auch in der Repristinationstheologie noch üblichen **Schriftbeweis.** Dieser entnahm der Bibel eine ganze Anzahl einzelner Stellen ohne Rücksicht auf den heilsgeschichtlichen Zusammenhang. Hofmann verlangt dagegen, daß mit der ganzen Schrift und zwar im Hinblick auf den heilsgeschichtlichen Zusammenhang ihrer einzelnen Bestandteile bewiesen werde. „Nicht bloß aus der ganzen Schrift, sondern auch mit der ganzen Schrift, haben wir den Beweis zu leisten."

Dementsprechend hat Hofmann in seinem „Schriftbeweis" dies Programm ausgeführt und das gesamte biblische Material in heilsgeschichtlichem Zusammenhang zum Beweis der hauptsächlichsten Grundgedanken des christlichen Lehrsystems dargestellt, das er an den Anfang des Buches gestellt hatte. Das andre Problem, welches Hofmann in Angriff nahm, war das **Kanonsproblem.** Aus der heilsgeschichtlichen Auffassung ergab sich mit Notwendigkeit die Schöpfung einer Schrift. Aber die Identität dieser Schrift mit

der uns tatsächlich in der Bibel vorliegenden Sammlung von Büchern ist damit noch nicht erwiesen. Die alte Dogmatik hatte die Inspiration und Autorität, welche der Schrift überhaupt zukommt, einfach auf die konkret vorliegende Sammlung übertragen; die neuere kritische Theologie hatte eine ganze Reihe von Schriften aus dem Kreis der glaubwürdigen urchristlichen Ueberlieferung ausgeschaltet. Als Ersatz jener älteren Anschauung und im Gegensatz gegen die neuere Kanonskritik, begann nun Hofmann das Riesenwerk: **„Die heilige Schrift Neuen Testaments zusammenhängend untersucht."** Er stellt sich zwei Probleme: Einmal soll die geschichtliche Untersuchung der uns vorliegenden Schrift ergeben, ob und in welchem Umfang sie wirklich Urkunde der heilsgeschichtlichen Offenbarung ist, zweitens soll ein Ueberblick der Geschichte der Kirche in ihrem Verhältnis zu dieser neutestamentlichen Schrift gegeben werden. Die zweite Aufgabe, die man kurz als eine Geschichte des **Testimonium ecclesiae für die Schrift** bezeichnen kann, hat Hofmann selbst nicht mehr ausgeführt, sondern ein andrer, von ihm angeregter Theologe Martin Kähler hat diesen Gedanken aufgenommen und wenigstens in einer großen Skizze ausgeführt. Hofmann selbst nahm in seinem Werk die andre Aufgabe vor, **den inneren Zusammenhang aller im Neuen Testament vorhandenen Schriften und damit die Notwendigkeit ihrer Zusammenstellung zu erweisen.** Wie etwa in einem Dom jeder Stein an seiner bestimmten Stelle steht und darum seine Entfernung den ganzen Bau gefährden würde, so soll es auch in der Bibel sein. Zu diesem Zweck begann Hofmann einen **Kommentar zum ganzen Neuen Testament,** der in den Dienst jenes letzten Zweckes trat. Dadurch ist die Eigenart seiner Exegese bedingt, der es auf den Nachweis des Zusammenhanges von Vers zu Vers, von Kapitel zu Kapitel ankommt, so daß jede Schrift als in sich geschlossenes Ganzes erscheint, aus dem man nicht beliebig ein oder das andre Stück als unecht ausscheiden kann. Aber auch die einzelnen Schriften des Kanons sollen auf einander gestimmt sein und eine die andre voraussetzen und bedingen. In ungeheurer Arbeitsleistung hat Hofmann eine große Anzahl von Schriften des Neuen Testaments kommentiert, ist aber durch seinen Tod an der Vollendung seines Werkes verhindert worden. Aber selbst wenn ihm der Abschluß gelungen wäre, würde das Buch doch nicht den gewünschten Nachweis für den Kanon gebracht haben. Denn dieser stand doch zu stark unter dem Eindruck einer vorgefaßten dogmatischen Theorie. Ohne eine solche hat der Nachfolger Hofmanns auf dem neutestamentlichen Lehrstuhl in Erlangen **Theodor Zahn** (geb. 1838) die einzelnen neutestamentlichen Schriften rein exegetisch und historisch-kritisch in einem **großen Kommentarwerk,** in einer „Einleitung in das Neue Testament," und in einer Kanonsgeschichte behandelt. Hier wurde nachgewiesen, daß unsre

neutestamentlichen Schriften so früh und von solchen Männern verfaßt wurden, die eine gute geschichtliche Kenntnis von der Offenbarung haben konnten. Der Kanon im Ganzen ist so frühzeitig und so natürlich aus kultischen Bedürfnissen zustande gekommen, daß wir in ihm eine glaubwürdige und authentische Urkunde der Offenbarungsgeschichte haben.

Auf Grund der bisher skizzierten Stellung der Erlanger Theologie zur Bibel, zu Bekenntnis und Dogma und der religiösen Erfahrung entwirft die Erlanger Theologie **ein dogmatisches und ethisches Gesamtverständnis des Christentums,** bei dem auch die Spekulation der Philosophie besonders Schellings mitgewirkt hat. Am zurückhaltendsten zeigt sich Hofmann in der metaphysischen Ausdeutung der **Trinitätslehre** und der **Christologie.** Er erkennt zwar noch die Ewigkeit der Trinität an, lehnt aber ihre nähere Bestimmbarkeit ab. In der Christologie bekennt er sich kurz zur Kenosislehre. Am eingehendsten hat er sich über das **Versöhnungswerk Christi** geäußert und dadurch auch in der lutherischen Theologie Befremden erregt. Lehnte er doch die stellvertretende Genugtuung durch Christus und das Ertragen des göttlichen Zornes ab. Positiv deutete er das Werk Christi im Sinn der alten griechischen Theologie und auch Schellings als einen Kampf mit dem Teufel. Das gute göttliche Prinzip in Christus erduldet alle Qualen des Bösen, entmächtigt dieses aber dadurch, daß es in gottwohlgefälliger Reinheit, im sittlichen Berufsgehorsam sich im Leben und im Sterben bewährt.

Viel stärker sind die spekulativen Gedankengänge bei **Thomasius** ausgebildet in seiner Dogmatik: „Christi Person und Werk." Einmal hat er das göttlich-trinitarische Leben näher zu durchdringen gesucht, in dem er es als einen in sich vollendeten Prozeß auffaßte. Vor allem aber hat er in der Christologie die **Kenosislehre** ausgebildet. Er bezog die Entäußerung nicht wie die altlutherische Dogmatik auf die mit der Gottheit geeinigte Menschheit Jesu, sondern auf die Gottheit des präexistenten Christus. Christus legt bei seiner Menschwerdung die sogenannten transzendenten Eigenschaften der Gottheit ab, die Allmacht, Allwissenheit, Allgegenwart, während er die sogenannten immanenten der absoluten Macht, Wahrheit, Heiligkeit, Liebe bewahrt. Thomasius hielt diese weitgehende Selbstentäußerung, um nicht zu sagen Umwandlung der Gottheit für notwendig, damit sie sich mit dem Menschen Jesus zu einem wahrhaft geschichtlichen Leben verbinden könne. Diese kenotische Theorie ist dann in verschiedener Abwandlung auch von den übrigen Erlanger Theologen vertreten worden, besonders von Frank. Von andrer Seite ist sie um so schärfer bekämpft worden.

Der ethische Typus der Erlanger Theologie ist einmal durch die Absicht charakterisiert eine **rein religiös-christliche Begründung**

der Sittlichkeit darzubieten. Es fehlt darum hier jeder Einfluß Kants und damit die Umkehrung des Verhältnisses von Religion und Sittlichkeit; nicht minder der imperative Pflichtencharakter. Statt dessen gilt als Ausgangspunkt und Kraftquelle des christlich-sittlichen Handelns bei Harleß und Frank mehr die Wiedergeburt, bei Hofmann mehr die Rechtfertigung. Hinsichtlich der **Verhältnisbestimmung der christlichen Ethik zur Welt hält die Erlanger Theologie eine mittlere Linie ein.** Eine völlige Verwerfung der Welt und ein dementsprechendes Handeln lehnt sie auf Grund ihres entschieden lutherischen Schöpfungsglaubens ab. Anderseits ist sie von der absoluten Ueberwertigkeit der Gemeinschaft mit dem transzendenten Gott gegenüber allen innerweltlichen Güter und von dem Tatbestand der Sünde, welche die Schöpfung durchdrungen hat, überzeugt. Es ist darum für den Christen ein asketisches Handeln im doppelten Sinn zu fordern. Einmal hat er alle immanenten Güter zum Mittel und Stufen zur Erreichung des höchsten transzendenten Gutes herabzusetzen. Sodann hat er das sündige Element in der Welt und seine Einflüsse auf die christliche Persönlichkeit auszuschalten. Infolgedessen hat der **Erlanger ethische Typus auch einen stark negativen Zug.** Er unterscheidet sich dadurch bestimmt von der neuprotestantischen Kulturethik, wie wir ihr bei Schleiermacher, Rothe und dann bei Troeltsch begegnen. Auf der andern Seite dagegen erstrebt sie **die positive Aneignung und Durchdringung der Welt des Schöpfers mit dem Geist des Erlösungslebens.** Eigentliches und nächstes Subjekt des christlich-sittlichen Handelns ist für die Erlanger Theologie der einzelne Christ in seiner erneuerten Innerlichkeit. Aber da der einzelne Mensch durch die verschiedenen sozialen Gemeinschaften bedingt ist und sie seinerseits beeinflußt, muß die christliche Ethik ihre Wirksamkeit auch auf die Gemeinschaften erstrecken. Aus rein christlich-sittlichen Prinzipien erwächst von diesen **sozialen Gemeinschaften** nur die Kirche und zwar die Kirche auch nur in dem Maße, wie sie eine rein religiös-sittliche und geistig-geschichtliche Größe ist. Die natürlich-sittlichen Lebensformen samt ihren Gütern sind dagegen nicht aus christlich-sittlichen Prinzipien ableitbar. Sie stellen vielmehr ihnen gegenüber selbständige, durch ihre immanenten, natürlich-sittlichen Prinzipien geleitete Größen dar. Auch in der Frage nach dem Verhältnis der christlichen Ethik zur innerweltlichen Kultur und ihren Sozialbildungen läßt sich von der Erlanger Theologie sagen, daß sie die hier notwendige Problemstellung in aller Schärfe besessen hat, nicht minder aber, daß sie auch die geschichtlich wie prinzipiell möglichen Lösungen sämtlich kannte.

Die „Religion Jesu.“*

Von Prof. Dr. W. Baur.

(Schluß.)

Das Reich Gotes in den Gleichnissen. Wie in den synoptischen Evangelien überhaupt, so stoßen wir auch in den Gleichnissen auf die drei Merkmale der Verkündigung Jesu; sie betreffen die Person des Predigers, die Kraft Gottes und das Reich speziell.

Von der Person des Predigers. Man raubt dem Reich seine Eigenart (Ewigkeitswert, Herkunft aus der Ewigkeit, Reich des Himmels) und verkümmert, verdreht, verweltlicht die Botschaft, wenn man dabei von der Person Jesu und der in ihm gegenwärtigen Gotteskraft absieht. Ohne Jesum gibt es überhaupt kein Evangelium, und ohne die Erfahrung der rettenden Gotteskraft bleibt die Verkündigung ohne wirklichen Wert, ja sie führt ins Verderben, wenn man sich ihr gegenüber verstockt. So redet Jesus im Gleichnis vom Hausbau am Schluß der Bergpredigt von der kritischen Bedeutung seiner Worte; von der Art, wie wir uns ihm gegenüber stellen, hängt unser bleibendes Geschick ab; man vergleiche das Gleichnis von den bösen Weingärtnern. Wen meint der Prediger, wenn er im Gleichnis vom Gärtner und dem Feigenbaum jenen sprechen läßt: „Herr, laß ihn noch dieses Jahr“? Er ist es selbst in seiner Sünderliebe, seiner Geduld, seinem Glauben an die Erlösungsfähigkeit der sündigen Menschen. Das vom verlorenen Schaf, sowie das vom verlorenen Groschen gehören beide insofern hierher, als Schaf und Groschen ohne die suchende Mühewaltung des Eigentümers verloren bleiben. Jesus ist gekommen die Sünder zu suchen.

Er selbst, der Prediger, ist es, der den guten Samen ausstreut, und er sendet seine Engel zur Zeit der Ernte. Er ist der Bräutigam, der um die Mitternacht die Schlafenden überrascht; er ist der König, der am Ende als Richter waltet. All das führt uns natürlich über die „Religion“ Jesu hinaus.

Von der Kraft Gottes. Die die Völkermasse durchdringende Gotteskraft wird im Gleichnis vom Sauerteig symbolisch dargestellt; unter dem Weib dürfen wir in letzter Instanz den Prediger selbst verstehen als den, der diese Kraft vermittelt. Es ist aber kein magischer oder chemischer Prozeß, sondern ein sittlich-religiöser; daher wird im Gleichnis vom verborgenen Schatz im Acker, wie in dem von der köstlichen Perle die entschlossene Hingabe der ganzen Person im Bild vor Augen geführt, ob wir nun dieser Kraft wie zufällig begegnen oder sie energisch suchen.

---

*) Hätte im Märzheft erscheinen sollen, war aber übersehen worden. Bitte um Entschuldigung. Ed.

Die Hingabe des ganzen Vermögens spricht sich, anders ausgedrückt, in herzlicher Buße und einfältigem Glauben aus; dies will uns das Gleichnis vom verlorenen Sohn melden; ähnlich die vom verlorenen Schaf und Groschen. Die Kraft der suchenden Gottesliebe ist es eigentlich, was zum Finden führt und bei dem verlorenen Sohn in Buße und sehnendem Glauben sich ausprägt. Ohne Hoffnung auf Annahme keine Wiederkehr, und ohne Reue keine sittliche Grundlage für diese Hoffnung. Die wiederherstellende Gotteskraft und reumütiger Glaube sind unzertrennlich miteinander verbunden.

Daß Jesus damit zu tun hat, steht uns in dem Gleichnis von den zwei Schuldnern deutlich vor Augen; nur im Umgang mit Jesus hat die große Sünderin Vergebung erlangt. Nun aber gilt: Je tiefer die sündenvergebende Macht gegriffen hat und greifen mußte, desto energischer die Liebe des begnadeten Menschen.

Doch ist dies kein dem Naturzwang unterstehender Prozeß; vielmehr ist nach empfangener Reinigung ein Rückfall in das alte Wesen möglich, der dann die Sünde steigert; dies lehrt uns das Gleichnis vom unsaubern Geist.

Umgekehrt ist es auch möglich, daß man sich dem Willen Gottes und somit dem Reich gegenüber zunächst verschließt, um am Ende sich doch eines Besseren zu besinnen, wie das Gleichnis von den zwei ungleichen Söhnen zeigt.

Von dem Reich speziell. Das Reich Gottes ist etwas Wachstümliches und Zielstrebiges; es hat eine eigene Organisation, seine eigenen Gesetze. Wie der sich selbsttätig entwistelnde Samen hat es seine Autonomie; es zieht das ihm zum Wachstum Dienliche aus dem Boden, in den es gepflanzt ist und wird. Auf der andern Seite zeigen die Gleichnisse vom vierfachen Ackerfeld und dem Unkraut unter dem Weizen an, daß dem Reich Gottes feindliche Gewalten in der Welt entgegenstehen; sein Entwickelungsgang ist also nicht ungehemmt und ungestört. Dabei hat es eine ihm innewohnende Ausdehnungskraft und eine die ganze Welt umfassende Bedeutung; es ist dem Sauerteig ähnlich und dem Senfkorn.

Diese ganze Entwicklung dauert, man weiß nicht, wie lange; sie gibt aber dem Guten wie dem Bösen Zeit zum Reifen. Indem das Reich Gottes in Raum und Zeit sich ausbreitet, kommt es in nahe Berührung mit dem in der Welt sich mischenden Guten und Bösen. Man kann also sagen: Im Kreise des auf Erden sich auswirkenden Himmelreiches befindet sich sowohl Gutes als auch Schlechtes. Aber nun soll eben jedem Gelegenheit gegeben werden, sich von der Himmelskraft des Reiches Gottes überwinden, sich mit ihr erfüllen und von ihr durchdringen zu lassen. Im Himmelreich auf Erden wirkt sich die Gotteskraft aus, so daß es ge-

wissermaßen die göttlichen Eigenschaften darstellt, das heißt das Verhalten Gottes dem Guten wie dem Bösen gegenüber.

Gott ist gut; er vergibt die Sünden und übt Barmherzigkeit. Darum sollen wir auch unsern Schuldigern vergeben: Im Himmelreich auf Erden wird die Vergebung geübt; das sollen wir aus dem Gleichnis vom Schalksknecht lernen. Wer da nicht mitmacht, geht seiner eigenen Vergebung verlustig. So hat die göttliche Güte einen sehr ernsten Hintergrund, so nicht minder das Himmelreich auf Erden.

Gott ist barmherzig und allezeit hilfsbereit; nicht anders, wer sich auf die Seite des Reiches stellt; er fragt nicht: Wer ist mein Nächster, sondern: Wem bin ich der Nächste? (Gleichnis vom barmherzigen Samariter.)

Die göttliche Güte erwartet keinen Lohn; so tut man im irdischen Gottesreich alles ohne Lohnsucht. Wer Lohn sucht, bringt sich darum; er wird eine Beute des Neides und der Mißgunst (Gleichnis von den Arbeitern im Weinberg). Gott selbst gibt, auch wo ihm nicht wieder vergolten wird; darum laden die Reichskinder die zu Tisch, die es nicht wieder heimzahlen können.

Der unauffälligen Wirkungsweise des Vaters, der im Verborgenen wohnt, entspricht unsre Demut. Sie macht nichts aus sich selbst und setzt sich gerade so durch (Gleichnis vom Untenansitzen.)

Zur Güte Gottes gehört auch seine Treue; er ist im Kleinsten treu, das heißt er achtet auf alles und beachtet alles in seiner Tragweite, weil er den geheimen Zusammenhang der Dinge kennt. Daher wird im irdischen Himmelreich die Treue eben auch dem Kleinsten gegenüber erwartet, das heißt den irdischen Gütern gegenüber (Gleichnis von den Pfunden, sowie das von dem ungerechten Haushalter). Untreu ist auch der, der sich auf irdische Güter verläßt, statt sie in dem Dienst des Ewigen zu verwenden (Gleichnis vom reichen Kornbauer). In diesen Zusammenhang gehört auch das vom reichen Mann und armen Lazarus; jenem fehlte es am rechten Gebrauch des Lebens; er war untreu.

Gott ist ein heiliger Gott; in seinem irdischen Reich handelt es sich auch um ernste und dem natürlichen Menschen ans Leben greifende Dinge; darum muß man nicht leichtsinnig in das Reich hineintaumeln; der Anschluß an diese Lebensgemeinschaft erfordert ernste Ueberlegung (Gleichnis vom Turmbau und Kriegführen). Dem heiligen Gott gegenüber gibt es keine wirkliche Anbetung ohne das Gefühl der Sünde und das Verlangen nach Gnade (Gleichnis vom Pharisäer und Zöllner).

Der heilige Gott gibt denen seinen heiligen Geist, die ihn ernstlich darum bitten (die mitternächtige Bitte).

Diesem Gott gegenüber gibt es kein menschliches Verdienst (Gleichnis vom Knecht); Gott läßt sich nicht spotten; seine Güte darf man nicht zurückweisen; Entschuldigungen scheiden uns vom Gottesreich (vom großen Abendmahl).

Auf das Endresultat der irdischen Entwickelung des Reiches weist das Gleichnis vom Netz hin, ebenso der Schluß des Gleichnisses vom Unkraut unter dem Weizen, sowie das von den Schafen und Böcken; es ist die große Scheidung.

Eschatologischen Gehalt haben auch die folgenden Gleichnisse: Das von den Knechten: Der Hausvater (die Gemeinde) weiß die Zeit der Parusie nicht; darum muß man wachen, das heißt treu sein (siehe das Obige), um nicht zum eigenen Schaden überrascht zu werden.

Das Ueberraschende der Parusie wird besonders auch im Gleichnis von den zehn Jungfrauen zur Darstellung gebracht; man muß also bereit sein. Zur Bereitschaft gehört auch das Ausharren in Gebet und Glauben (Gleichnis vom ungerechten Richter); ferner: Ernst im Ringen um den Eingang in das Reich (Gleichnis vom Hauswirt) und Treue (Gleichnis von den Zentnern).

6. Jesus und die Zukunft.

Wenn Jesus in der Aussendungsrede sagt: „Geht aber und predigt und sprecht: Das Himmelreich ist nahe herbeigekommen," so ist dies ein Zeugnis für seine Ueberzeugung, daß mit ihm und der Predigt des Evangeliums das Himmelreich den Menschen nahegebracht sei. Wenn er dann fortfährt: „Machet die Kranken gesund" usw., so erhebt sich die Frage: Ist dann das Himmelreich nicht schon vor diesen Taten da? Allerdings, und Jesus sagt nicht: Führet das Himmelreich herbei, indem ihr diese Dinge tut. Das stimmt auch mit dem bekannten Spruch: „Trachtet am ersten nach dem Reich und der Gerechtigkeit Gottes, dann wird euch das Uebrige alles zufallen." Die Umdrehung dieses Verhältnisses ist in manchen Kreisen gerade heute sehr beliebt. Man meint, erst müsse man die äußeren Verhältnisse bessern, dann könne man überhaupt nur nach dem Himmelreich streben. So wie es jetzt stehe, zögen jene, die nicht nach Gottes Reich und Gerechtigkeit trachteten, den größeren Vorteil daraus. Das ist nicht im Sinne Jesu gedacht. Er verachtet natürlich das Jetzt und das Heute nicht, aber er lenkt den Sinn auf das Jenseits, um das Diesseits erträglich und fruchtbar zu gestalten. Der Leib und das leibliche Leben sind vergänglich; ihm handelt es sich um bleibende Dinge.

Darum kommen auch im Vaterunser diese zuerst, und wenn es am Schluß heißt: „Erlöse uns von dem Uebel," so dürfen wir dabei freilich auch an die einzelnen Uebel denken, womit wir eben jetzt besonders geplagt sind; aber der Hinweis auf die große kom-

mende Erlösung darf nicht übersehen werden. Weil Jesus uns wirklich gründlich helfen wollte, darum weist er uns über die Gegenwart hinweg auf die Zukunft, da alles zurechtgebracht werden soll, nicht durch Menschenwitz und Menschenkraft, sondern durch Gottes Hand.

Man behauptet, er habe diese Zukunft sehr nahe geglaubt; wenn man jedoch an seine Hinweisung auf die Tage des Menschensohnes denkt und beherzigt, daß er selbst offen erklärte, den Tag des Endes nicht zu wissen, dann wird man doch andrer Meinung sein müssen. Er war ein Prophet und schaute die Zukunft in der Perspektive. Daß Jesus von dem Kommen des Reiches Gottes in Herrlichkeit, von seinem eigenen Wiederkommen, von Scheidung und Gericht, von Auferstehung und endlicher Weltwiedergeburt oder Weltverklärung überzeugt war und demgemäß lehrte und ermahnte, das geht aus den biblischen Quellen deutlich hervor; es sei bei dieser Gelegenheit auf den in Nummer 4 (1926) dieser Zeitschrift erschienen Artikel über „Die Lehre Jesu von den letzten Dingen" verwiesen. Mit der „Religion Jesu" kommen wir da freilich nicht mehr aus.

Aber er hat doch, wenn er die Vollendung aller Dinge nicht nahe glaubte, so wenig über die künftige Organisation seiner Gemeinde gesagt? Das ist natürlich richtig; allein der Spruch vom prinzipiellen Trachten nach dem Reich Gottes schließt auch dieses ein, und prinzipiell hat Jesus dieses Problem für alle Zeiten gelöst, indem er sagte: „Ihr wisset, daß die weltlichen Fürsten herrschen, und die Oberherren haben Gewalt. So soll es unter euch nicht sein; sondern so jemand will unter euch gewaltig sein, der sei euer Diener."

Soviel ist sicher: Es war Jesu ein wichtiges Anliegen, daß das Evangelium gepredigt werde. Er hatte den Reichsgottesblick: Das Missionsfeld ist die Welt. Seine Jünger sind das Licht der Welt und das Salz der Erde. Er schaut bis ans Ende und weiß, daß das Evangelium in der ganzen Welt gepredigt werden wird; ganze Nationen werden unter seinem Schatten wohnen, nicht nur Abkömmlinge Abrahams.

Daher lautet sein Befehl: „Gehet hin in alle Welt." Aber die große Sache überwältigt ihn nicht; sein Blick wird durch die Aussicht auf den Erfolg nicht verwirrt noch getrübt. Er beginnt beim Naheliegenden und sendet seine Jünger zunächst nur zu den verlorenen Schafen vom Hause Israels, obwohl er weiß, daß eben diesem Volk das Reich genommen werden sollte. Er selbst wirkt gelegentlich auch unter den Heiden, wird aber trotz oder wegen seiner Einsicht in den Charakter und das Geschick des Judenvolkes nicht müde, gerade an seiner Seele ernstlich zu arbeiten. Dabei ist

er ein starker und eifriger Beter, der es nicht versäumt, seinen Mitarbeitern das Gebet recht kräftig ans Herz zu legen, das Gebet im allgemeinen: „Dein Reich komme," und im besondern: „Bittet den Herrn der Ernte, daß er Arbeiter in seine Ernte sende."

Er bezeichnet seine Jünger als Menschenfischer; beschränkt ihre Wirksamkeit jedoch nicht auf das Predigen des Wortes, wie er selbst seine Sämannsarbeit mit der des Arztes verbindet, des Helfers in Leibesnöten. Seine Wirksamkeit erstreckt sich auf Juden und Heiden und umfaßt Leib und Seele, Diesseits und Jenseits.

So hat Jesus weniger an die Organisation als an die Mission gedacht, sein Blick schweift in die Ferne und streift immer die Ewigkeit. Es kommt der Tag der Rechenschaft, der Erntetag, der Tag der Vergeltung. Den Lohngedanken hat Jesus nicht einfach zurückgewiesen; mit den Worten: „Wer euch aufnimmt, der nimmt mich auf; und wer mich aufnimmt, der nimmt den auf, der mich gesandt hat" ist eigentlich alles gesagt. Wir sollen satt werden; wir sollen getröstet werden; wir sollen Gott schauen. Jede gute Tat soll belohnt werden; aber die Lohnsucht ist verderblich; sie bringt uns um den Lohn. Nur die Liebe, die nicht das Eigene, darum eben auch nicht Lohn sucht, wird belohnt; die Selbstsucht richtet sich selbst zugrunde. Ohne diese Liebe, die Gott und dem Nächsten selbstlos dient, gibt es keine Lösung der sozialen Frage; kein System kann sie ersetzen; keine Methode kann ohne sie zum Ziele führen. Dieser Liebe Ziel ist die Ewigkeit, und ihre Methode ist das Martyrium.

„Der alte und der neue Glaube.“*

Eine Erwiderung von Frau Emilie Schaefer.

Daß der obige Titel schon von verworrener Geistesrichtung zeugt, ist sonnenklar; denn der wahre Gottesglaube muß wie Gott selbst sein, gestern, heute und in Ewigkeit derselbe.

Vom logischen Standpunkt aus kann es sich darum bei obigem Artikel nicht um die Gegenüberstellung oder Vermittlung zwischen einem alten und neuen Glauben, sondern um Glauben und Unglauben, um Christentum und Antichristentum.

Weil aber nicht nur Schriftgelehrte die Synode ausmachen, sodern tausendmal mehr Laien, Männer, Frauen und Kinder, die auf die Lehre ihrer Schriftgelehrten angewiesen sind und für welche Glaube oder Unglaube ihrer Lehrer, für diese und die zukünftige Welt, von den unberechenbarsten Folgen ist, so ist es nur recht und billig, daß eines von ihnen endlich an Ort und Stelle den Mund auftut, für diese Stummen.

Schreiberin will sich nicht aufhalten bei den Präliminarien dieses Artikels, da es darum handelt, was in unsrer Bibel Gottes Wort sei oder nicht. Auch diese Frage ist ja so alt wie das Menschengeschlecht und eingeführt durch das, dem Gotteswort gegenübergestellte Wort der Schlange: „Sollte Gott gesagt haben?“ Sie will vielmehr übergehen zum zweiten Teil, in welchem die Allerweltsfrage behandelt wird:

Wie dünket euch um Christum, wes Sohn ist er?

Jesus stellt diese Frage selbst an die Schriftgelehrten, um ihren Messianischen Glauben zu prüfen. Um ihnen jedoch zu bedenken zu geben, daß ihre Antwort, er sei Davids Sohn, seine Herkunft nicht decke, so läßt er die zweite Frage folgen, wie denn dieser Sohn zugleich Davids Herr sein könne?

Sie sind ihm die Antwort schuldig geblieben, wie so viele sie uns heute schuldig bleiben. So auch in obigem Artikel. Die Antwort steht aber ganz unzweideutig 1. Joh. 4, 1—7 und ist unbestreitbar. Eine Vermittlung gibt es hier ebensowenig, als zwischen irgendeinem andern Vater und Sohn. Wer da glaubt, daß Jesus Christus, der Gottmensch, nicht Jesus der Mensch, wie die Stelle in besagtem Artikel fälschlich wiedergegeben ist, ins Fleisch gekommen ist, der ist von Gott. Wer das nicht bekennt, der ist der Widerchrist, der den Vater und den Sohn leugnet. Eine Vermittlung gibt es hier nicht, auch keinen alten oder neuen Glauben.

Hier gibt es nur ein großes, ein weltweites Entweder-Oder. Und es ändert diese Tatsache, worauf in der genannten Abhandlung besonders aufmerksam gemacht wird, nicht im Geringsten, daß die

---

*) Siehe Theol. Magazin No. 2, 1928.

ganze Welt, Gelehrte und Ungelehrte, Juden, Heiden und Mohammedaner und ganz besonders vermittelnde Christen, diesem Jesum große Ehre erweisen. Das ist weiter nichts, als Menschenvergötterung und deckt sich mit der Verheißung der Schlange: **Ihr** werdet sein wie Gott.

In sechzehn Zeilen wird die positive Seite dieser Leben und Tod bedeutenden Frage der negativen Seite gegenüber gestellt, die mehrere Seiten füllt, sodaß, wenn man es liest, man unwillkürlich zu dem Schwert des Geistes greift, welches das Wort Gottes ist, vorausgesetzt, daß man es zur Hand hat. Und doch soll diese Abhandlung ja nur eine harmlose Gegeneinanderstellung sein des neuen und alten Glaubens, eine Abhandlung, die uns überzeugend klartun soll, daß kein Mensch sagen kann, wer recht hat, denn „jeder Teil kämpft mit der Bibel in der Hand" (der Herr Einsender vergißt, daß der Teufel das von Anfang an getan hat) und schließlich kommt es nach 1. Kor. 13 wie „sie" die Stelle anwenden, nämlich die Anhänger dieses neuen Glaubens, garnicht auf den Glauben, sondern auf die Liebe an. Mit dieser Liebe, um die Konsequenz bis zum letzten Ende zu ziehen, was doch logisch erlaubt sein sollte, brauchen wir gar kein Schwert des Geistes auch kein Entweder-Oder, sondern können uns ruhig mit Isaschar auf den Zaun setzen und mit Pilatus achselzuckend ausrufen: „Was ist Wahrheit."

Und um die jungfräuliche Geburt Jesu zu beweisen, bleibt ja schließlich doch nichts übrig, als die Stelle im Matthäus, diesem neuen Glauben gemäß.

Wie neu dieser Glaube ist, geht aus den Lästerungen hervor, welche die Geschichte der Juden anführt, die die Maria zu einer gemeinen Dirne stempelten.

Und ist denn nicht unser Apostolikum dadurch entstanden, daß diese selben Einwendungen, wie sie der neue Glaube jetzt macht, damals schon gemacht wurden? Und das oben angeführte Wort 1. Joh. 4, und andre Stellen, die gegen den Antichrist mit seinem Anhang gerichtet sind, sind sie nicht ein Beweis, daß schon die Apostel diesen Unglauben bekämpften und ihn durchaus nicht in Liebe aufnahmen?

Und ist es wahr, daß wir keinen andern Beweis haben, als die Bibel, daß Jesus Gottes Sohn ist? Sokrates mußte den Giftbecher trinken, weil sein Leben und seine Lehre verworfen wurde, obwohl viele sagen, daß sie der Lehre Jesu gleichkam. Aber er ist tot und nichts ist übrig geblieben, das ein neues Leben erzeugt hätte in den Menschen, die nach ihm kamen. Als Jesus seinen Geist aufgab, da standen ein paar Frauen unter dem Kreuz und der Jünger, den er lieb hatte. Die andern, welche bestimmt von ihm, als dem Messias, erwartet hatten, daß er das Messianische Reich sofort aufrichten werde, sahen all ihre Hoffnungen vereitelt und waren geflohen,

aus Furcht vor den Juden und versteckten sich hinter verschlossenen Türen. Aber der Tod Jesu war nicht das Ende, er war der Anfang der Neuschöpfung, welche aus seinem Sterben hervorsproß.

„In ihm war das Leben und das Leben war das Licht der Menschen."

Von keinem andern Erdenbürger oder Religionsstifter konnte das je gesagt werden nach seinem Tod. **Er ist der da lebt,** von Ewigkeit zu Ewigkeit und daß das wahr ist, das haben Millionen an sich selbst erfahren, und viele haben es mit ihrem Tod bezeugt. Ist das kein Beweis der Gottessohnschaft Jesu Christi?

Und dann soll man die in Liebe als gleichberechtigte Gläubige ansehen, die diesen Gottessohn und die Liebe des Vaters, der ihn gesandt hat, mit Füßen treten und dieses Blut des Neuen Testaments unrein achten! Wolken ohne Wasser, welchen behalten ist Finsternis und Dunkel in Ewigkeit, nach den Worten der Schrift. Machen „sie" denn unsern göttlichen Herrn und Meister nicht zum Lügner und seine Apostel zu Betrügern, versündigen sich am Geist Gottes, der durch diese Zeugen redete und begehen so die Sünde, welche niemals vergeben werden kann. Mit Wissen und Willen verstocken sie sich selbst.

Daß die Unwahrheit niemals logisch ist, das könnten diese Vertreter des neuen Glaubens an ihren eigenen Beweisführungen sehen, wenn sie es wollten.

Und nun, nachdem die Gottheit Christi in Frage gestellt ist, und so leidlich abgetan, stellt uns dieser neue Glaube der Erlösung gegenüber, „so durch Christum Jesum geschehen ist," wie sich die Schrift ausdrückt. Denn wenn Jesus nicht der Christ und nicht vom Geist aus Gott gezeugt ist, so kann er unmöglich die Welt durch sein Blut mit Gott versöhnt haben. Und das Zeugnis der Schrift, daß ohne Blutvergießen keine Vergebung möglich ist, wie verhält es sich damit, angesichts dieses neuen Glaubens? Man höre und staune! Der Ausweg ist gefunden. „Die Gerechtigkeit Gottes . . . muß . . . der Barmherzigkeit und Liebe Gottes, als den größeren Eigenschaften, weichen." So dekretieren „sie." Und wir vom alten Glauben? Sagen wir nicht ja und Amen dazu? — Ja, Gott sei Lob und Dank, so sagen auch wir, nur auf einem andern Weg. Während „sie" **die Liebe und Barmherzigkeit Gottes** beanspruchen, wie es in ihren Kram paßt, so wir einzig und allein nach Joh. 3, 16. Auf **die** Liebe Gottes, die der armen, verlorenen Welt seinen eingeborenen Sohn gab, der, nach dem Vorbild, das Gott dem Moses gegeben, durch die am Kreuz erhöhte Schlange, allen Barmherzigkeit und Liebe anbietet, **die an diese Versöhnung glauben,** anders nicht. Darauf fußen wir. Aber gerade das ist ja dem Antichrist ein Dorn im Auge. **Er will sich selbst** erlösen. „**Ihr** werdet sein wie Gott." Darauf steuert ja die ganze

Welt hinaus und, sagen „sie," der gerechte Gott kennt, was für ein Gemächte wir sind, er gedenket daran, daß wir Staub sind. Deshalb kommt er uns in Liebe entgegen. Darauf fußen „sie." Warum durch Jesu Blut gerecht gemacht werden? Dieses schreckliche Kreuz, dieser Schandpfahl, nie und nimmer kann das von Gott so gewollt sein. Die ganze Bibel, die ganze Blut- und Opferpraxis des Alten Bundes, ist ja alles Einbildung, Gott will ja garnichts davon, er hat es ja selbst gesagt. Und so nehmen „sie" denn wieder diese nach ihnen so verkehrte Bibel zuhilfe, um klar und deutlich zu beweisen, was? Daß der natürliche Mensch nichts versteht vom Geist Gottes, daß es ihm eine Torheit ist und kann es nicht erkennen, denn es muß geistlich gerichtet sein.

Das ist alles, was zu diesem Wortschwall von Begriffsverwirrung gesagt werden kann. Die schönsten, herrlichsten Gottesworte werden benützt, um das Gegenteil zu beweisen von dem, wozu sie gegeben wurden. Aber es wird dabei bleiben, was Paulus sagte: Das Wort vom Kreuz ist eine Torheit denen, die verloren werden; uns aber, die wir selig werden, ist es eine Gotteskraft.

Und nun folgt der dritte Abschnitt, Wiederkunft des Herrn und Gericht. Da schwindelt einem. Da werden die vom alten Glauben beschuldigt, daß sie die Hände in den Schoß legen und nichts leisten, zur Besserung der Verhältnisse in der menschlichen Gesellschaft. Sie warten auf die Zukunft des Herrn, der alles zurecht bringen wird und vorher lohne es sich nicht, einzugreifen. Wenn man das liest, und kennt die Weltverbesserer, die das den wahren Christen in die Schuhe schieben, da „bekommt man's mit dem Zorn," wie die Pommern sagen. Darum nur zum Schluß einige Fragen:

Der Ebraerbrief, der sowieso all die Fragen, welche in besagtem Artikel aufkommen, ausführlich für alle diejenigen zur Zufriedenheit beantwortet, welche daran glauben wollen, zählt im elften Kapitel „eine Wolke von Zeugen" auf, welche durch den Glauben die Welt bezwungen haben. Waren sie Leute vom alten oder neuen Glauben?

Und die Zwölfe, „ungelehrte Leute und Laien," die wenige Wochen nach der Kreuzigung ihres Meisters furchtlos ganz Jerusalem und Juda und Samaria mit ihrem Bußruf erfüllten, waren sie Anhänger des gepriesenen neuen Glaubens?

Und die Christen des ersten Jahrhunderts, die so zuversichtlich und täglich auf ihren Herrn und seine Wiederkunft warteten, haben sie darum ihre Hände in den Schoß gelegt oder sind sie es nicht gewesen, von denen ihre Feinde sagten, daß sie mit ihrer Lehre den ganzen Erdkreis bewegten?

Und wer arbeitet heute noch, ohne vor allen Dingen zu fragen, was wird mir dafür?

Deutschland allein hat 35,000 Diakonissen, sind sie Boten des neuen Glaubens?

Und all die Reichsgottesanstalten in der weiten Welt, wer hat sie gestiftet und erhalten?

Ein Zinzendorf, ein Wichern, ein Bodelschwingh, ein Georg Müller in Bristol, eine Elisabeth Frey, und wie sie alle heißen, diese Großen im Reich Gottes, wem haben sie gedient? Dem Menschen Jesu oder ihren göttlichen Meister, an den Elendesten unter den Menschen?

Können „sie" mit ihrem sozialen Evangelium, durch das man sich selbst erlösen zu können meint, das nachmachen?

Und unsre eigenen Missionare, predigen sie Christum und seine Erlösung oder „ihr werdet sein wie Gott?"

Der Tag wird es klar machen, sagt die Schrift, welcherlei eines jeglichen Werk gewesen ist. Warum sollte man es denen verargen, die sich weigern, Holz, Heu und Stoppeln als Baumaterial zu gebrauchen, weil es dem Feuer nicht Stand hält?

Und auf Sand baut, wer den Grund und Eckstein, Jesum Christum, verwirft. Ist da eine Zusammenarbeit möglich?

Es sind ja so unendlich viele, die diesem neuen Glauben huldigen, laßt sie zugreifen, das Warten auf die Wiederkunft des Herrn hindert sie ja nicht. — Aber das ist gerade, wo es happert.

Die Hauptfrage jedoch, die mir um der Laien willen die Feder in die Hand drückte, ist diese: Hat irgendein Lehrer in unsrer Evangelischen Synode ein Recht, anders zu lehren, als unser Bekenntnisparagraph anweist? Sind unsre Pastoren nur dem Schein nach auf das Apostolikum verpflichtet oder in der Wahrheit?

Es gibt eine Denomination, wo die Anhänger dieses „neuen Glaubens" mit offenen Armen empfangen würden, es sind die Unitarier. Sollen wir das werden oder gehören solche Lehrer nicht **dahin**?

Es ist ja Privatsache, was ein jedes für sich glauben will. Es ist jedoch nicht Privatsache, was unsre Synode uns und unsre Kinder zu lehren gestattet.

EDITORIALS

CLERICAL TYPES

They say ministers are the worst listeners. If their own members, during a service, behaved as they do themselves they would feel outraged—so it is claimed. They don't sit still, they talk with their neighbors, they draw their watches, they do everything they ought not to do. These charges, though grave, may be true; but the writer claims they cease to be true as soon as a real man with a genuine message rises in the pulpit. When that happens there is not a man in the audience whose attention is half so absorbing and intelligent as the minister's. That was at least our experience when we attended this year's Pastors' Convention at Columbus, O. We referred briefly to this Convention in our German Editorial, in the March number, when speaking of Dr. Speer. But we feel we should be guilty of a sin of omission if we did not try with our humble pen, to draw a few more pictures of some of the outstanding men there, and of the way they presented their message.

If we were asked which one of all the speakers we heard impressed us most, we probably should say it was *Dr. Merton S. Rice,* of Detroit; and we don't care a bit if others disagree with us. We knew the man for we had heard him one summer at Lakeside, O. His theme was then: "The Poor Boy Who Became Great." It was the life story of Bishop Quayle, who had been a friend of the speaker. On that subject he entertained a large crowd for two hours! It was a hot night but we did not mind the heat a bit; we sat there as people entranced. Now if we have a man in our Synod who could perform a similar feat with equal success, we shall call that man blessed.

It was the same in Columbus. We heard only his address on the "Irresistible Christ". But he had no sooner stepped forth, that man of large body and not at all distinguished appearance; he had no sooner started with a few humorous remarks, when the old spell was there again. His text was quite unusual. It was: "But we see Jesus," with the accent on the *but.* He said there is crime in the world, perfect waves of crime: But there is Jesus; so we don't despair. There is sin, trouble, death in the world: But there is Jesus. Over against all these awful, disheartening things he matched Jesus and his inexhaustible resources. And you should have heard his stories. He has many of them, stories of his own experience. How he tells them! He photographs them on your

mind, he doesn't forget the slightest detail if it is relevant; and how he plays on your emotions. The time flies and you don't notice, and you only wish that he would go on talking. He is very informal, sometimes his hands are in both his trousers' pockets. He is a law unto himself. He is not an intellectual giant, he does not deal with philosophical problems. But he is large-souled, well-read, and draws from a seemingly ever-flowing fund of life experience. If we were to state exactly what makes him so attractive, we should possibly say it is his amazing naturalness, and the spontaneousness with which thought, humor, story, appeal bursts forth from him.

Soon after Dr. Rice there appeared on the platform a young man of about 36, of frail stature, with a great mass of hair on his head (already greying though), and with a cheerful smile on his face. It was *Dr. Bernhard C. Clausen,* of Syracuse, N. Y., the "laughing kid" among all those worthies. The man was the sensation of the Conference. The people went wild over him. Just imagine his extreme youthfulness! And he capitalized it somewhat. The weather was bad at times but he went around bareheaded, college-boy fashion. This youngster had an ease of manner on the platform that most of us don't achieve in a lifetime. His diction was perfect, his command of language very unusual. But he laughed too much. Long before he would burst out laughing one could see it coming, in his face. The forerunner was already there while there was nothing to laugh about as yet. He over-worked the laughing part, so that at times he was the only one laughing in the audience.

One of his subjects was: "How to be angry." He said the seminaries had been adding to their curiculum all kinds of subjects in the last 10 or 20 years. One, however, they had not thought of yet. And he was going to supply the lack and give his hearers a course in the "lost art of being angry." Then he explained that being angry, like accumulated steam, might bring about a destructive explosion or, self-contained and directed in the right way, might render a useful service. The speaker in working out his illustration showed very considerable homiletic skill. But when he was through with his discourse he turned around to the presiding officer notifying him that his class had now finished their course, and asking him, in recognition of their proficiency, to confer on the members the degree of M.A., Masters of Anger.(!) We didn't like this oratorical stunt, it made the whole performance look like acting. The chairman, staid old Dr. Van der Pye, did not like it either, we could see; nor did Dr. Merrill, the pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church, of New York, who followed him as speaker.

The reason Clausen had been asked to speak was because he had been making experiments in his church with getting reactions from his audiences, to his preaching, and these experiments had given him a good deal of publicity. He had preached a second time a number of his sermons that had been selected by a poll of his congregation. The reasons why these sermons were chosen a second time, he stated, were as follows: 1) they were "different" (he himself, at one time, had sung 3 negro spirituals in the service); 2) They were brief, 10-15 minutes; 3) they were newsy; 4) they were simple; 5) they had been somewhat dramatized.

We see the man affects the sensational. Inspite of his undoubted gifts he repelled us (the Ed.). He came to our Cleveland Lenten services the 3rd time this year; we didn't even go to hear him once; so much the worse for us, perhaps, but we could not stomach him. The subject of his Lenten addresses were: "The Lost Art of Laughter;" "The Gospel from a Sky-Plane;" "Jesus, the Gentleman;" "Light-House-Keeping;" "How to Remember."

The man who followed Clausen as we said before, and with whom we shall close this review, was *Dr. Merrill,* of New York City. He was as different from Clausen as he possibly could be. Even in appearance. If Clausen, being the young filly he was, had been cutting all kinds of capers on the platform, Merrill reminded one of an old war-horse. Not that he had a militaristic program. On the contrary he is the president of the Church Peace Union and of the World Alliance for International Friendship through the churches. But he was an older man (past sixty), mature, giving one the impression of quiet strength and manly confidence in himself and his message. His subject was, "An American Peace Program." Some of the points included were: "Bring about the outlawry of war; clear up the Monroe doctrine; say what relation the U. S. is to have to the League of Nations; foster good relations with England; no intervention in the interest of American investors in other countries; America must lead in progressive disarmament (the rich man ought to set the example of simplicity)." We see it was a political sermon although the speaker did not forget the religious emphasis ("Keep on having faith in God, in Christ, in peace"). As a good Presbyterian he believes in the church as a factor in moulding public opinion. He seemed to have in him the stuff out of which Christian "statesmen" are made, a quality that one would never even think of when listening to, say, Rice. Rice is a preacher only, perhaps of the individual gospel chiefly, but a prince as a preacher. Merrill is the *preacher* in *politics,* a student of great modern movements and actively affiliated with the forces that seek a Christian control of such movements.

There were many other clerical types represented in the speakers of that Convention, for those who could stay to the end. About 50 of our own church attended the Convention. They all testified gratefully to the good impressions received, and expressed the confident hope that next year one of our own successful men should find a place in the program.

Die „Kinder der Propheten."

Das Problem der religiösen Beeinflussung unsrer Jugend macht uns mit Recht viele Kopfschmerzen. Die Frage: Ist unsre heutige Jugend schlimmer als die Jugend vergangener Tage? wird tausendmal gestellt und so oder so beantwortet. Die Pessimisten sagen uns: Die Kinder sind nicht wie die Väter waren. Die Väter lebten in einer einfacheren Welt. Sie waren mit wenigem zufrieden, sie fanden ihr Glück mehr in inwendigen Dingen. Es war leichter, sie für Religion und Kirche zu gewinnen. Die heutige Jugend lebt in einem materialistischen Zeitalter. Das Land ist reich geworden, Luxus und Vergnügungssucht haben überhand genommen. Alle Stände, jedes Alter ist von diesem Geist angesteckt, aber besonders die Jugend fällt ihm zum Opfer. Religiöser Ernst und sittliches Streben sind bei ihr so rar wie Ringeltauben. Die Optimisten dagegen lächeln über diese bedenkliche Diagnose. Sie weisen uns darauf hin, daß vor dreißig Jahren unsre Großväter gerade so dachten von denen, die damals jung waren, wie die jetzigen Väter und Mütter von ihren Kindern; daß also die ganze Sorge hinauslaufe auf die Unfähigkeit der Alten, sich auf den Standpunkt der Jungen zu stellen. Es sei ohne Zweifel wahr, daß jede Zeit ihre besonderen Gefahren habe. Es sei wahr, daß der junge Mensch dieser Nachkriegszeit sich anders geberde als die Generation vor ihm. Er verlange mehr Freiheit und Ungebundenheit. Aber wenn man seine gerechten Wünsche erfülle, so sei auch mehr Verlaß auf ihn. Ein mehr ausgebildetes Verantwortlichkeitsgefühl gebe ihm Initiative und Selbständigkeit.

Wir wollen uns in dieser Frage weder für die eine, noch für die andre Seite entscheiden. Wir halten dafür, daß auf jeder Seite etwas von Wahrheit zu finden ist, daß demnach der lateinische Satz auch hier seine Geltung hat: „In medio tutissimus ibis."

Worauf es uns ankommt, das ist die Anwendung dieser Betrachtung auf unsre pastorale Jugend, auf die „Kinder der Propheten" von heutzutage. Die Kinder (englisch: „sons") der Propheten im Buch der Könige waren ohne Zweifel die jungen Männer, die sich in den Prophetenschulen auf ihren zukünftigen Beruf vorbereiteten, demnach gleich unsern heutigen Seminaristen. Wir wollen den Ausdruck aber auf unsre jungen **Pastoren** anwenden.

Sind die jungen Pastoren, die jetzt einen so großen Einfluß auf synodale und gemeindliche Dinge ausüben, die Erben des Geistes ihrer Väter?

Einen so großen Einfluß, sagen wir. Denn vor dreißig Jahren, als wir selbst zu den jungen Pastoren gehörten, hatten dieselben gar keinen Einfluß. Nur selten meldete sich einer zum Wort bei den Konferenzen, und wenn er es tat, wurde das im ganzen für ein Zeichen von unerhörter Dreistigkeit gehalten. „Bescheidenheit ist eine Zier," so glaubte man damals. Jetzt ist es in manchen Distrikten gerade umgekehrt. Die englische Sprache wurde eingeführt, die alten Leiter sahen sich ins Hintertreffen gedrängt, und die Jugend ergriff die Zügel.

Der Wechsel in den Verhältnissen beschränkte sich aber nicht auf die Konferenzen. Nein, die Gemeinden wendeten fast ohne Ausnahme den **Söhnen** der Propheten ihre Gunst zu. Bei Pastorenwahlen hatte — und hat — Erfahrung, Dienstzeit, innere Reife nichts, gar nichts zu sagen. Der Mann von 25 hat immer vor dem von 45 den Vorzug, aus dem einfachen Grund, weil er 25 und nicht 45 ist.

Diese Tatsache wird ja auch auf andern Gebieten bemerkt. Jugend und damit Tatkraft und Rührigkeit ist auch im Geschäftsleben eine Empfehlung. Der ältere Pastor, oder sagen wir der Pastor der alten Schule, was man auch immer zu seinen Gunsten mit Recht anführe, hat nicht die **Aggressivität** der jungen Pastoren. Er besucht wohl seine Gemeinde und seine Kranke, so fleißig wie, oder fleißiger als der junge. Aber er ist nicht so unternehmend, er bringt nicht so viele neue Mitglieder in die Gemeinde. Er ist auch in Gefahr, mit alten Gebäuden, einer alten Kirche, einem alten Pfarrhaus zufrieden zu sein, während der junge bald mit seinen Bauplänen kommt und seine Gemeinde willig macht, für ein modernes Kircheneigentum viel Geld auszugeben. Dabei steht dem jungen Pastor eine größere Anpassungsfähigkeit zu Gebot. Worauf es ihm ankommt, ist der Erfolg, und den sucht er früh und spät, auf alle und jede Weise.

Ein anders Wort für dies Anpassungsverfahren ist das Streben nach **Popularität**. Man muß sich bei den Leuten beliebt machen: ein durchaus gerechtfertigtes Bemühen, wenn in rechten Grenzen gehalten. Das ist dem einen leichter als dem andern, je nachdem ihn die Natur ausgestattet hat. Aber wenn einer mal in dem Strom des allgemeinen Wohlwollens dahinschwimmt, so kann er sich bald nicht mehr seiner selbst wehren, der Strom übersteigt weit seine Kräfte. Er hat von einer Speise gegessen, die seinen Gaumen kitzelt, von einem Trank getrunken, der ihn berauscht. Das nächste, was er nun tut, ist, daß er sich einer geheimen Gesellschaft, oder mehreren, anschließt. Das ist zwar noch gegen ein Synodalstatut,

aber dies letztere ist doch eigentlich schon lange ein toter Buchstabe. Und es macht populär — das ist das große Lebensgesetz.

Der junge Pastor **leistet** etwas. Er mehrt die Gemeinde, füllt die Kirche, pflegt die Vereine, führt die Sonntagschulen zu neuen Höhen. Und die Gemeinden sind erkenntlich. Sie geben ihm den dreifachen Gehalt von dem, was vielleicht sein Vorgänger, ein Mann der alten Schule, hatte. In dieser Beziehung muß der alte die Segel streichen. Er hatte nicht den Wagemut, das siegreiche Selbstvertrauen, das solch frisches Leben hervorrufen konnte. Er konnte sich auch nicht der Mitarbeit der Glieder versichern, auf die der moderne Geistliche rechnen kann.

Ob nun die Söhne der Propheten ihren Vätern an geistiger Kraft und geistlicher Aufrichtigkeit gleichstehen, ob sie Männer des Gebets und Glaubens sind wie viele der Väter waren, ob sie ebenso feste Grundsätze und tiefe Ueberzeugungen haben wie jene — das ist eine ernste und wichtige Frage, doch wer will sie beantworten? Alles was wir sagen können, ist, daß sie in Gefahr sind, in diesen Punkten eine geringere Nummer zu bekommen, denn der äußere Erfolg ist doch nicht alles, und wer nach ihm zu sehr strebt, wird blind gegen die Menschlichkeiten, die da mit unterlaufen.

Wenn wir die Alten und die Jungen vergleichen, so sehen wir, daß sie wesentlich anders eingestellt waren; daß die einen wie die andern etwas haben und etwas nicht haben. Es bedürfen also die einen der andern, damit sie sich gegenseitig ergänzen. Daher muß unser Wunsch sein, daß sie sich beide verstehen lernen, so daß sie sich einander helfen können, und die Kirche „der Gaben die Fülle" habe (um mit einem methodistischen Schlagwort zu schließen).

The Christian World

Not for Me, Thank You!

EXTENSION MAGAZINE, CHICAGO, NOVEMBER, 1927

ALICE TORMER

There have been four different occasions when I seriously considered matrimony. I didn't realize at the time what kept me from it. I know now, and because a large and increasing number of women have held to single blessedness for much the same reason, I think that I have a duty to break through my natural reserve and set it down.

To do this adequately, I must background myself. I am the third daughter in a family of four girls and three boys. My people on both sides are Roman Catholics.

I didn't think much about marriage until I was through the convent, where I was one of a class of fifteen.

There was no particular economic necessity for any of us marrying in haste. I vaguely supposed that in time I would marry. My oldest sister did the year after she finished school. My next older sister was engaged, and it seemed to me a matter of time when I should follow their example.

My sister just older than I was about to marry when my oldest sister came home to live. Because of conditions which she declared were intolerable she had left her husband. My father and mother disapproved of her action, even while they were willing to help her rebuild her life.

It was my first experience of seeing the inside of any marriage but my father's and mother's which, of course, I took for granted as an institution which had no problems. I cannot tell, even now, what a shock my sister's revelations of her unhappiness aroused in me. Genevieve, just ready to marry, refused to regard it in any way related to her own life.

"All men aren't like Bob," she said. But four years later she divorced her husband and went to work in the city where they had lived.

There were two instances of failure in my own family. Is it any wonder that they deterred me from rushing into marriage? And yet my younger sister married the year she came out of the convent, and has remained most happily married through all these years. She never listens to anyone's story of unhappy marriage, but it seems to me that they have been forced upon me through my grown-up lifetime. Here are some of them:

Grace W. had to come home to her mother because her husband literally starved her and her little girl into giving him a divorce so that he could marry another woman.

Ellen M. had married a man whose terrible drinking of post-Volstead liquor drove him into madness which endangered her life.

Laura L. married a man whom she had known nearly all her lifetime. Somehow they didn't get along financially, and she didn't have the strength to stand constant reverses. Her immediate crowd was wealthy, and she grew frightfully discontented. Finally her husband went away. She sued for divorce, won it, and a few years later married a rich man.

Eva J. eloped with a young Jew. They were married by a justice of the peace and disowned by their parents. For some years they seemed to get along. Then she divorced him. He remarried immediately. A few years afterward she married a wealthy man.

You will say that these are isolated instances. They are, possibly. They are four, however, of the nine cases of divorce which have occurred in my immediate group, the fifteen of us who graduated from the same convent. There has been a general idea, within and without the Catholic Church, that Catholic women are not rushing into the divorce courts. But the fact remains that my two sisters have been divorced, and that nine of the fourteen girls who went to school with me—and a Catholic school—have been divorced.

If I did not know that this same condition is holding among other Catholic groups I might be inclined to think that there was something wrong with our group training. But I see the same thing everywhere. I went the other day to a luncheon where all the women were Catholics. Of ten women, four were divorced, all of them for good and adequate legal reason.

We Catholics were the last to go down before the modern idea of individual right to happiness. We had been so long trained in the Catholic ideal that marriage was not a romantic condition of bliss, but a vocation for the working out of life that we expected less from it and gave more to it than did other women. My mother had, I know now, that point of view. She took everything as it came, and made the best of it, regarding marriage as irrevocable. My sisters refused to see it that way. They reflected the attitude of our age rather than of our Church. I do not doubt, from the stories I have listened to, that the other nine women of my immediate acquaintance did the same.

Now I know that I'm no better, no stronger, no more fitted for misery than any one of my family and friends. I am, perhaps, not a particularly good Catholic, although I try to be; but I am a good enough Catholic not to bring my Church into scandal. If I married, and divorced my husband, and wanted to marry again, I wouldn't go hunting loopholes through the Church, even in the canonical law concerning annulments. I'd take my medicine. But I couldn't escape the fact that I had been a Catholic. Now I'm no saint, and so it's far easier to stay a spinster than risk the martyr's crown.

I have a good time in these early autumn years, and when I look around even at my happily married minority of friends I can't see that their possession of each other and children is any insurance against a lonely old age. Husbands die, and children go away. I know the mother of ten children who sees one of them twice a year, and never sees the others at all. Call me what you will, you cannot call me more

than I have called myself, a coward who has feared the arena of life; but my justification is that even the women of my own faith did not seem to find in it the strength to go through with their job.

Why didn't they?

Weren't they good enough Catholics?

Was it something lacking in themselves?

Or was it that the age was too much for them?

These aren't academic questions. I really want to know the answer. If I get an answer that will prove to me that my immediate environment is not the rule of present-day marriage, even among Catholics, who can tell what I might do?

London's First Fellowship of Faiths

Zion's Herald, Boston

CHARLES FREDERICK WELLER

Twenty-five hundred people in the first floor and two galleries of London's great religious center, the City Temple! Five hundred people in an overflow meeting downstairs—where the upstairs program was repeated. Standing-room filled. Unknown numbers of eager men and women turned away entirely! Over two thousand reserved-seat tickets asked for in advance. Such is the record of London's first Fellowship of Faiths, Thursday, July 21, 1927—a red-letter day which will be remembered as beginning in Europe a spiritual movement that promises to inspire and to unite East and West, America, England, Europe, and the Orient, across the old barriers of race and creed.

"Yes, for toleration is not enough," said Dr. Annie Besant, the last speaker at the London meeting (because Theosophy begins with "T"). "Let us agree upon the new principle of appreciation with which this Fellowship of Faiths is bridging the old deep gulfs of creedal prejudice. Toleration is patronizing and scornful; it says, 'You may think what you like—but I know you are wrong.' Instead, we are to appreciate the value of every religion and to seek to add its beauty to our own. It would be a poor world if the sun sent down only one ray or color. Out of the white light which shines upon us from the sun—uniting all the colors of the spectrum—each growing earth life takes the colors or rays which it needs. So with the Truth which comes as the great white light from God; each of us takes what he needs at his stage of growth. Each faith has its own color. Appreciation unites in one greater glow the fragments of truth which each religion represents."

The Moslem call to prayer, chanted by the muezzin of the London Mosque, picturesque in his turban, with fervid earnestness which stirred the great throng reverently despite his Arabic language, opened the meeting at exactly 5:15 p. m. At 7:05 p. m., on scheduled time, Rev. Dr. F. W. Norwood, who presided as pastor of the City Temple, closed the meeting with his Christian, yet universal benediction. In alphabetical order, the seven faiths were presented, beginning with Buddhism, of which Hon. Dr. W. A. de Silva of Ceylon was spokesman.

"Buddha's message has elevated souls into peaceful living, all over the world, for many centuries. Why? Because he taught men how to overcome the selfish desires which subject us to the ceaseless discords of life."

America's own international Young Men's Christian Association leader, Dr. Sherwood Eddy, spoke for Christianity. "I rejoice in this notable Fellowship of Faiths," he said, "as a symbol of the new world. When Buddha and Jesus have so long taught brotherhood, why have we achieved so little? Cannot all faiths agree that war is wrong? Without hatred based on lies, the World War could not have driven 26,000,000 people to their tragic deaths—40,000,000 if we include those dead of revolutions, famines, pestilence which the last war developed. In the early church, he who became a Christian, stopped being a soldier. It rests with us to cease boasting of our rival theologies and stand together for what all religions teach, peace and brotherhood. This impressive assembly today shows that the world's great faiths can stand together. By so doing, they can save the world from war."

Dr. Wei-Chang Che'n, head of the Chinese Embassy in London, unavoidably out of town, sent his written message. Confucius, born 551 B. C., taught that "within the four seas (meaning throughout the world) all men are brothers." "Confucius emphasized the goodness of all men everywhere, instead of the war-promoting doctrine that some people, in lands outside our own, are essentially alien, inferior—natural objects of suspicion, hatred, and attack. Confucianism emphasizes the social duties to be performed by every individual. It has never recognized the soldier as of high social rank. Materialism, too, it subordinates to ethics. Politics and politicians are singularly subjected, in China, to Confucius' ethical ideals. And one in every five of our whole globe's inhabitants are followers of Confucianism—a mighty world influence for brotherhood and peace."

Maharajadhiraja (meaning, King of Kings) Bahadur of Burdwan, famous potentate of a rich native state in India, spoke for Hinduism. He quoted with approval the English writer who says: "The test of a dogma is its universality. As long as the Church of England preaches a single doctrine that the Brahman, the Buddhist, the Mussulman, the Parsee, or any of the other sectarians who are British subjects cannot accept, it has no legitimate place in the counsels of the British commonwealth." He spoke of two Hindu terms, "Basthee" (individuality) and "samasthi" (collectiveness). "We must get to the Samasthi through the Basthee—through the faith of the individual to the Fellowship of Faiths; through the League of Neighbors to the League of Nations."

Judaism was represented by Rabbi Moses Gaster, who said he spoke "for the smallest nation and the oldest faith. Why has the Hebrew faith prevailed unbroken through the ages? Because it represents the ideals of brotherhood and peace for which this Fellowship of Faiths is striving—mightily with glorious promise, international, interracial, interreligious, loyal to the spirit of the one universal God and to the universal brotherhood of all mankind."

Mohammedanism or Islam, the Moslem faith, was presented by two speakers, Abdul Majid and Maulvi A. R. Dard. "If a Moslem refuses to believe in Jesus, he ceases to be a Moslem. For the follower of Islam believes in all the religious prophets; his faith includes the teachings of all religions. Islam means peace. The Moslem ten commandments include mercy as Jesus taught it on the Mount of Olives, self-effacement, unity. No other religion is so tolerant. No other has so nearly approached the ideal of a League of Nations. Moslems believe fervently in the principles of the Fellowship of Faiths—criticizing no man's religion, emphasizing those spiritual and ethical fundamentals in which all great faiths agree."

The one woman on the program, Dr. Annie Besant of India, England, and the world at large, spoke in the name of Theosophy, but her oration—for it was truly an eloquent oration—interpreted the vision and purpose of the Fellowship of Faiths and prophesied its profound, wide-reaching influence for world unity and peace and brotherhood.

A Hindu devotional song, accompanied by a strangely gentle stringed instrument characteristic of the Orient, was sung in the middle of the program by Dilip Kumar Roy, in his picturesque purple Indian robes. The chanting of the Moslem call to prayer, in Arabic, had been the opening music of the meeting. For thirty minutes before 5:15 p. m., when the meeting began, Mr. Allan Brown, organist and choirmaster of the City Temple, had played devotional organ music. Finally, at 7:05 p. m., the City Temple's vested choir led the vast throng in singing—as none so well as London congregations can sing—the universal hymn written by our American Oliver Wendell Holmes:

"Lord of all being, throned afar."

Under Which Flag, Benzonian?

The pledge of the Evangelical Synod of North America "to withhold its support from any war" is sufficiently lacking in details to arouse wonderment as to just what the Evangelical Synod of North America proposes doing in the event, say, of the United States becoming involved in hostilities with another nation.

Always in the past, when combat has opened between the government of the United States of America and an opposing force, our citizenship has been divided into three classes—those who supported the government, those who opposed the government and those who hid out.

There is absolutely no reason nor basis for an opinion that different conditions can develop in the event of another armed conflict in which this republic participates. Some citizens will help their country, some will join the enemy and some will skulk. The Evangelical Synod of North America owes it to itself particularly to say now and soberly and openly which of the three courses it intended, when it voted a pledge of no support in its Chicago meeting last Friday, to bind itself to take. Kansas City *"Journal Post."*

Spiritualism, the Religion of the Future *

The National Spiritualist, Chicago

MRS. MARY RIDPATH-MANN, Editor

Report of Address Before Thirty-fifth Annual Conv., Nat'l Spiritualist Assn.—San Antonio, Tex., Oct. 10-15.

The speaker based what she had to say upon a remark once made in her presence by a former Secretary of State who said: "He is the wisest and most fortunate of men who knows *what* he believes and *why he believes it!*"

"The late John Hay, when he spoke those words, did not know that he was talking about the Spiritualist," said Mrs. Mann. "But he was! We have the story from the olden mythology of a man named Diogenes who set forth with a lantern in search of an honest man. One might turn the most powerful searchlight known to modern invention upon the Spiritualists of the world, but he would not find among them one individual Spiritualist who does not know what he believes and *why he believes it!*

"What all other religionists believe the Spiritualist *knows*. All that the follower of any orthodox religion, be it Catholic or Protestant or Jew or Gentile, can say is: "I believe!" Each and every one of these rejects the proof of that which he believes. The Spiritualist accepts it. The orthodox declare "*I believe* in the immortality of the soul!" Says the Spiritualists, "*I know* that the Continuity of Life is a fact, because—I can prove it!"

Mrs. Mann declared that the first Psychical Research Society ever known was founded upon the shores of the Sea of Galilee twenty centuries ago, and consisted of twelve members and one Teacher. She pointed out that in the olden days the psychic senses,—clairvoyance, clairaudience, etc.,—were common among men and that the Great Teacher of Nazareth, instead of surrounding himself with highly-educated Pharisees and Saducees, chose for his associates simple tillers of the soil, carpenters and fishermen, knowing that the man who lives close to Nature lives close to God! She held that no brilliant mind of any modern period had ever excelled in accuracy the definition of the word *Faith* given by Paul in his Letters to the Romans and averred that the bit of advice which followed that definition held the finest counsel ever offered to any living creature. *To your Faith add Knowledge!* This, she holds, is what the Spiritualist has done.

The speaker referred to the oft-heard complaint that all Spiritual messages are trivial. "What if they are?" she demanded. "Did it matter that the first message flashed without wires across our ocean by Marconi was unimportant? The significant thing was that *he got it across!*" She related the old, old story from the Odyssey of Homer

---

* It is hardly necessary to say that the opinions in these selected articles reflect the views of the writers, not of the Editor of the "Magazine." Ed.

of the return in spirit of Ulysses. His father demanded of him proof that it was really he and when he replied: "These trees under which we stand are those you planted when I was a boy." Could the old man doubt, after that, that he was talking to the spirit of his son? All intelligent investigators of phenomena recognize the value of the so-called "trivial" message. More often than not, in its very triviality lies its evidential value!

Mrs. Mann referred to the address of the evening before at the Municipal Auditorium in which the speaker, Elizabeth Harlow-Goetz, had spoken of "*The Need of a Great Religion.* Spiritualism," said Mrs. Mann, "is that religion!" No longer can the "streets-paved-with-gold" heaven and the "lake-of-fire-and-brimestone" hell of the orthodox religions withstand the onslaught of modern thought. The "faith of our fathers," of which the passing generations have heard so much, means little to the present day young man and woman. Youth, immature as it is, has discovered for itself an appalling fact. So strenuous are our daily lives that no amount of philosophy can make them wholly rational. No amount of religion can make them wholly serene. No amount of love can make them wholly capable of service. But if there is anything in the religion offered him that he can not live with twenty-four hours every day Youth will have none of it! He can not make use of an impractical religion!

In closing, Mrs. Mann held that because of what it has to offer to humankind Spiritualism can not fail to become the Religion of the Future. "It has been said, and that recently," she went on, "that Spiritualism is not Religion. How absurd a thing! If that which expresses belief in Infinite Intelligence; if that which holds that all this great, wonderful universe is the expression of that Intelligence; if that which teaches that whatsoever one sows that also must he reap; if that which tells me that the 'communion of saints' and what I know as 'spirit communication' are one and the same; if that which urges me to do unto others as I would that others shall do unto me; if that which tells me not that man *has* a soul but that man *is* a soul; if that which teaches me that the laws of Nature are the laws of God; last and most satisfying of all, if that which tells me that the doorway to reformation is never closed against any human soul, here or hereafter; if that teaching which embraces all these things is not Religion, then there is no such thing as Religion upon the face of this earth!"

Mrs. Mann closed with a plea that the people of San Antonio should not forget the visit of the National Spiritualist Association. "It will be of little import that we have carried a torch into your midst," she said, "if after we are gone you permit the flame to flicker and go out. Should it chance, therefore, that during this, our mortal life, as an Organization we shall pass this way no more, it is the prayer of every individual Spiritualist that you will not forget the message which Modern Spiritualism is thundering to the world. That message you have heard preached and seen practiced since we have been in your midst: There is no death! There are no dead!"

Watchman, What of the Night?

The Virginia Churchman, Richmond

W. E. Cox

Closing Address of the Virginia Conf. of Liberal Evangelicals

In matters of religion today, we face a condition, not a theory. There are many who think, and rightly, that with the ever widening field of human knowledge, shedding new light on old truths, there should be some restatement of the old truths in the light of the newer knowledge.

Then there are those who fear, and with much reason, that those most enthusiastic about the newer knowledge may become so enamored of the newer views of truth that they lose sight of, or do violence to, the truth itself. For example, it is one thing to *reinterpret* the Creed, in the light of knowledge former generations did not have; it is quite another thing to discredit the Creed itself, or sweep it overboard altogether.

In a situation such as this three things are important:

First, a fixed purpose to cultivate and to keep, as far as is possible under the limitations of our poor human nature, a balanced mind. Truth is one, but we see it from many angles, and the balanced mind seeks to understand, and to appraise at its true value, the point of view of others as well as that of one's self. It seeks also to comprehend and to hold to the wholeness of truth, not to exaggerate a fragment of truth at the expense of truth in its wholeness. The new and the old in religion are but different aspects of truth, and the balanced mind will neither reject the old and substitute the new, nor exaggerate the new out of proportion to the old, but seek to keep both rightly related.

Second, we need to keep unmistakably clear the distinction between the eternal verities of the faith and the purely human theories of men in their effort to explain the faith. It is legitimate for us, in the light of our day, with its marvelous advance in every field of human knowledge, to review and revise the purely human theories and interpretations of all preceding generations, provided only we review and revise the *theories* and *interpretations* of men *about* the eternal verities, not impugn the eternal verities themselves.

Thirdly, and most supremely, we need renewed allegiance to our Lord Jesus Christ, through deeper and truer faith in Him. If that faith is real, and not a mere sentiment, it means that we believe in Him enough to take Him at His word, and to do as He said do. The institutions which He established because He, in His wisdom, knew that our poor human nature needed them, come to have for us an authoritative force not hastily pushed aside by individual opinion or the changing moods of changing years.

In the first place we have His explicit teaching, and the teaching of the Apostles trained directly by Him, recorded in Holy Scripture. His Word, then, as recorded in Holy Scripture, constitutes for us an authority above that of our own limited knowledge.

Then we have the age-old Institution called the Christian Church. By "the Church," be it remembered, we are not thinking of voluntary associations of men for reasons of practical expediency, either in the present day or in the days of the Apostles. The first mention of the Church in the New Testament is by our Lord Himself. The personal pronouns, "My" Church, and "I" will build, clearly indicate that the idea was His own, and that He executed it upon His own initiative, as a part of His plan for the redemption of the world. It is a striking fact that on the day of Pentecost, the very first day that the Apostles began to preach under their own leadership, the Church was there, an established fact; for the converts were immediately baptized into it, and we read that "the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved." The first general council of the Church is evidence of the fact that its authority in matters of doctrine and of practice rose above that of any individual or group of individuals within the Church.

Likewise the Ministry of the Church was not an impromptu ministry. It also was divinely instituted, and its functions specifically defined. "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you" (S. Jn. 15: 16). "As my Father hath sent me, so send I you" (S. Jn. 20: 21). The Apostles so understood it, for we read regarding Judas, "he was numbered with us, and had obtained part of *this ministry*" (Acts 1: 17); also that Matthias was chosen "that he may take part of *this ministry* and apostleship, *from which Judas by transgression fell*" (Acts 1: 25). Their mission was likewise specified: "Go . . . teach . . . baptize . . . teaching them to observe all things *whatsoever I have commanded you.*"

The Sacraments, too, were given to the Church by the Master, and come down to us on His authority, but for the purpose of this paper we pass them by and come to the matter of the Creed.

It is often thought and sometimes said that the Creed called "The Apostles' Creed" was not the creed of the Apostles at all, but a formula that somehow just grew up in the Church long years after the Apostles' time. What are the facts?

When our Lord sent His Apostles out to their work under the terms of "The Great Commission" He said to them: "Ge ye therefore, and teach all nations, *baptizing them in the name of the Father*, and *of the Son*, and *of the Holy Ghost.*"

This simple baptismal formula was from the very beginning of the Church, and is now, the heart of the Christian faith, and when, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the Church did amplify it, she did so by simply writting-in the Scripture record of the nature and work of the three Persons of the Godhead, without one touch of human opinion or of philosophic speculation.

But after all, and aside from all this, the problems of Christendom are not so much intellectual as spiritual.

When we have used to the uttermost the intelligence God has

given us, if it brings that wisdom which ought to be the handmaid of knowledge, it must, sooner or later, convince us of the limitations of finite human knowledge, and call us back to that simple statement of faith given us by the dear Lord Himself and enshrined in the Apostles' Creed.

"Lord, I believe: help Thou mine unbelief."

The Evangelical Synod, Heading In — Where?

The Evangelical Synod (*Unierte Kirche*) has been fighting the Lutheran Church since its first organization. Its leaders have found fault especially with the Missouri Synod for its strict anti-unionistic stand and have ransacked the dictionaries, both German and English, for hard words to apply to us. We shall not repeat them here because they do not make pleasant reading, and we strive to please. But now the question: Where has the Evangelical Synod landed through its boasted "freedom in non-essentials"? Where will an ocean liner land when it discards its rudder at the dock? The final moorings of the Evangelical Synod are not yet in sight, but we are able to mark some of the later stages of its rudderless journey. The *Theological Magazine* of that church-body last year contained an article entitled "The Dilemma of the Eden Graduate." Eden Seminary is the theological school of the Evangelical Synod, and a dilemma is any situation in which one has the choice of two evils. Now, the dilemma described in this article is due to the fact that the Evangelical Synod still has a catechism containing such doctrines as original sin, the atonement through Christ's blood, the resurrection of the dead, etc., while at the theological seminary the students are taught that quite a few of these doctrines are old rubbish. The seminary, says this writer, has heeded the call for "up-to-dateness" and so has discarded, for instance, the belief in angels as "fantastic speculative dogma." But the catechism still teaches the existence of angels! Again: "You flunk in Eden in case you answer in an examination that man lost the image of God as a consequence of the fall of the first man; while, if you teach the answer that is there considered correct, after you have entered the ministry, you will be denounced as a heretic," since the catechism still teaches original sin. Worst of all: the catechism teaches the substitutionary atonement through the blood of Christ, while the seminary professor teaches that in Christ's work "we have not by a judgment of God a transference to us of a performance of His, as that of another person,"—a plain denial of the sacrificial death of our Lord. The writer of the article complains that this "practise of teaching one theology in our seminary and expecting our graduates to preach another" causes hopeless confusion; in fact, "Eulenspiegel could certainly not have thought of a more ridiculous situation." But this situation is simply the result of consistently living up to the unionistic principle.

Lutheran Witness.

Book Review

(When ordering books, please mention this Magzaine.)
NOTE—Reviews, when not signed, are by the Editor.

The Life of the Spirit and the Life of Today, by *Evelyn Underhill.* New York, E. P. Dutton & Co., 1922, 311 pages.

The author, an English woman, is perhaps the best-informed scholar of the mysticisms of all lands and times. Her seven other publications are all, without exception, on this subject. Her exposition of the spiritual life, in this volume, also has a decidedly mystical tinge. The spiritual life is to her the awareness of the God-presence. Like other mystics, she takes little interest in the difference of creeds and of religions. Religious life is found everywhere; and while our devotional text book is the bible, the spiritual nature of other people finds its nourishment in other sacred books. She quotes largely from Christian mystics, but also from the Mohammedan Sufis and from Hindu teachers. Plotinus, the Neo-Platonist, seems however, to be her special favorite.

Her chief aim is to interpret the abiding facts of the spiritual life. The spiritual life is not a creation of the imagination; it is not an element that may be left unconsidered by the practical; it is not a department only of human life. No, it is life in its fulness; the life of the spirit is, indeed, immersed in the streams of history, but it is poised on the eternal world.

Psychology has, in the last ten or twenty years, given increasing attention to the phenomena of the spiritual, but it has not invalidated any of its essential features. In fact, it is not the function of psychology to either prove or disprove the reality of religion; it can only interpret it in accordance with the established methods of psychological investigation. The author does not undertake a philosophical proof of the spiritual. We find it everywhere, at all times and in all places. It has left its mark on history, on culture, in literature; it is in evidence to-day. The materialist only could deny its reality. All others will take it as a most important fact of human life.

Psychology (and biology) has rendered us a service by helping us understand old facts under new names. Original sin is rejected by most of the modern-minded; as the survival of primitive instincts it is accepted even by the biologist. According to the evolutionist the history of primitive man covered millions of years, the history of civilized man only a few thousand. What wonder that the archaic, the primitive, the animal is still a mighty force in his development. The vital factor in nature is not thought, not the intellect but instinct, that powerful urge in human nature that seeks for self-expres-

sion, self-preservation, for fulness of life. It is the task of religious education to *sublimate the instinct*, to give them a higher content, to direct them to the highest reality, to God. We must find a place for man's last stage of development, the spiritual consciousness.

In these ways we learn to understand in modern terms what Paul meant by the old and the new Adam, the natural and the spiritual man. What the bible attributes to the solicitations of the devil we understand as the uprushes of our primitive or animal past. Sin is a falling back to past levels of conduct, a relic of our zoological past; it is a failure to correspond with the light which we now possess. Salvation is the healing of the conflict by the unification of the instinctive and the ideal life. Conversion is the turning of the lower desires into higher channels.

Perhaps this "sublimation of instincts" is actually nothing else than the theological change from the natural to the spiritual man; the getting of new motives, ideals and satisfaction, at least in effect the same as regeneration: how does this fundamental change come about?

Here the author refers first to the great God-conscious men of the past as living examples of the reality and creative power of the spiritual life, and as generators of such life in others. She finds that these men—largely all of the mystical type—derived their power from *contemplation*. They had the gift of turning away from the "window" of ordinary consciousness to the "fore-conscious," the fringe of the conscious where reverie and meditation go on, the prayer region. In this region they learned *to be still* and *find* the *divine presence*. This discovery gives a great joy—it is always tinged with feeling—invests with a sense of security and power. It leads to complete surrender, makes God present to the spiritual eye everywhere; and one of its main effects is the love of one's fellows, an all-inclusive love having nothing to do with race, station, or worldly possession. Such transformed personalities have a contagious influence, they gather groups around themselves where, by sympathy and imitation the spirit of the founder is propagated.

The writer shows how faith in its effect on the person who has it and on others, strickingly resembles the psychological term of *suggestion*, whether auto- or hetero-suggestion. By no means does she want to exclude the divine factor, but to emphasize the cooperation of human will and "grace," the mood of expectancy preparing the individual for the reception of the divine action. The conditions for an effective suggestion are quiescence, attention and feeling. Sometimes the mere repetition of a word or phrase has surprising results: it strengthens attention and heightens feeling.

From these mystical examples, in which the author delights (by the way, she always mentions Paul, St. Francis, St. Theresa, John of the Cross, Kabir (?), Fox, John Wesley—but *never Luther* although he certainly had much of the mystic temperament), she now turns to the *Church*. The Church certainly plays an important place in the God-discovery and the cultivation of the spiritual. The writer has a

great regard for the Church. The Church keeps the balance between stability and novelty. She is "embodied history," and the progress of man depends on conserving and exploring; she must have room for the priest and the prophet. Her cult "hands on the life aiming at God," it creates the atmosphere of prayer, it makes for the largest possible suggestibility. In her cult there accumulate in time modes of thought and approach that we have outgrown; there must be elimination, therefore, from time to time. There are other elements in the church: the ministry, beliefs and denominations (and loyalty to them). Miss Underhill has little to say about these.

She is more interested in the directly spiritual, in the cultivation of spiritual character, the stages being: humility, repentance, complete surrender. As a modern example of a perfect saint she cites Sadhu Sundar Singh. In him the question as to how to develop the natural into the spiritual, finds a complete answer. His habit of silence and spiritual absorption, his seeking of God and him only, his determination, his suffering, his supreme spirituality and humble naturalness, the combination of contemplation and ceaseless activity point the way in which others may be led to similar experiences.

In the closing chapters the author speaks about the part *education* ought to play in the spiritualization of the young. It is in part an emphatic stressing of the need of mystical culture in the child and young person; in part a sublimation and employment of all natural instincts (herd instinct, the creative, heroic, adventurous) that she advises.

In the last chapter she speaks of the social implications of the spiritual life: the "social gospel." While she agrees that the individual culture should be supplemented by the spiritualizing of the social order, she is convinced that this can only be done by individuals who have cultivated in themselves the mystical or contemplative elements and hand on their spirit to others (being "crowd-compellers"). This way is naturally slow, but it alone leads to real success.

The book shows an amazing insight into the deeps of religious mysticism. Most of the chapters are inspiring and stimulating.

A person can hardly read, especially the first chapters, without experiencing a tonic effect on his prayer life. We cannot endorse all she says. All religions are more or less good to her; we should put more stress on the likeness of all faiths than on their differences. Forgiveness of sin, the atonement, the resurrection, the things on which we base our faith, are not even mentioned. She concentrates entirely on the mystical element of prayer and faith. Wordless prayers, or prayers consisting of a word only (God, God, God! or, Sin, Sin—out!) are often better than the ordinary kind. We differ here entirely. Whatever be the experience of the advanced mystic, the ordinary Christian should express as well as collect his thoughts in an orderly way, even audibly, often starting from bible words. But we have already taken up too much room: the book is the product of an exceedingly spiritual soul but it has its limitations.

Christ at the Round Table, by *E. Stanley Jones,* author of "the Christ of the Indian Road." The Abingdon Press, 1928. 328 pages, $1.50.

We discussed "the Christ of the Indian Road" in the July number of 1927 (pp. 309, ff.). The book was then in its 6th edition although the first had only appeared in 1925. The book was so remarkable by its spirituality that many anxiously looked forward to the next production from the same hand. This is now before us in the volume under discussion. After reading most of the book, we say that Stanley Jones has not disappointed us. There is the same deep earnestness, the same hold on religious reality, the same Christian certitude, and the same sympathy with, and understanding of, the elements of truth in other religions.

Mr. Jones knows that the attitude in comparative religion has swung from the former extreme of absolute repudiation to the other of saying all religions are one in the center. Christianity is only one of the many ways of finding in God a dynamic for right living. It may be the best one so far, but its claim to finality is untenable. The highest stage in the religious evolution of the race will probably be a sifted amalgam from the whole.

The author does not share this "broad minded" attitude of the day. He is fully convinced that Christ alone is equal to the needs of man. But he holds this conviction not only because he has found him so in his own experience, or because he has been able to defeat the adherent of other faiths in argument. He has met with them in fraternal conferences. Hindus, Mohammedans, any kind of non-Christians, have sat with him at the table, not to argue but simply to say *what their religion has meant to them.* Men of various professions, men in high positions, men of the highest culture, two thirds of them in every case non-Christians, have been asked to state what they had found of religious certainty, of unification of life, of character-building energy as a result of their religious experiences. They have sat, not with Jones only, but with "Christ at the Round Table"—and in every case Christ has come out victorious; he controlled the situation at the end of every conference.

The readers of "The Christ of the Indian Road" will not be surprised to find that the author again strikes the note of spiritual *experience* with telling effect. Any man, any missionary with only an ordinary amount of experimental religion would hardly have dared to expose himself to such a test. But the reader of this book will realize that Mr. Jones was by his consecration, his humility, his discernment, his Christlikeness eminently fitted for the task.

The Indian is naturally religious. His soul, like nature, abhors a vacuum. There is no race that has with such earnestness striven for religious truth. No language is so well equipped with religious and philosophical terms as the languages used in this land. But they have *not found.* Their religions are pantheistic. God is the All, and man's redemption is found in his absorption in the All. Their God lacks personality and the highest task for man is to get rid of his

individuality, whether this be done by way of self-renunciation, of worship or of good works. It is highly interesting and often pathetic to read the self-revelations made in the pages of this book by some of the best men of India. There is to be noted a diffusion of the sense of the divine with all of them, but also a great uncertainty. None of them has *found*. Even Gandhi—whom the author interviewed at one time—says, "it may take ages" (this process of identification with the All).

Mr. Jones is sure that the soul of India offers a great opportunity to Christian missions. But only a church that has the power to convert is equal to the task. Our greatest danger, he says, is not from anti-Christianity, but from sub-Christianity. The redemption we bring must be a collective redemption: Jesus will save everything that is good in Indian life.

The author's emphasis on personal experience as the decisive thing in religion may seem to expose him to the danger of subjectivism. He discusses this in a chapter, "Certainty and Authority." Where is religious certainty to be found, when can we say we have final authority for our experience on our side? When the individual experience is certified and corrected by collective Christian experience, or still better, when the Jesus of history becomes the Christ of experience, and the resultant experience of the individual is corroborated by that of the church. Here the three factors, the Word, the Church and the individual are the trinity guaranteeing the reality and validity of the religious life in the soul.

The book abounds in wonderfully fascinating examples of the transforming power of the Christian religion in the life of the Indian people. The author, although conversant with all movements of the modern intellect, is at all times in close touch with the throbbing spirit forces, always *in Christ*, to speak with Paul. We know of no recent book where the reader is so sure of a rich spiritual feast as in this one.

Does Civilization Need Religion? by *Reinhold Niebuhr*. The Macmillan Company, 1928. 242 pages, $2.00.

The author, already well known by his consistent endeavor to recover for us the ethics of Jesus as a criterion for the appraisal of modern ethics, here examines what religion has done for our present-day civilization. His conclusions are not reassuring to the religionist. According to Niebuhr the Christian religion has wholly failed to make our civilization ethical, so much so that millions have ceased to hope for anything from Christianity in this direction. But the question the writer seeks to solve in this book is whether "the present social impotence of religion is due to innate defects or to specific and historical limitations which the years and the demands of the times may change."

"Modern science has depersonalized nature and modern industrialism has debased personality." There we have the two powerful foes that threaten the very life of religion in its emphasis on personal val-

ues. And of the two the church has directed its fighting energy chiefly upon the former. It has made its peace with evolution, but has insisted that back of the evolutionary process there is the power of the Creator. Evolution was simply the mode used by the creative spirit. However, to make civilization ethical is a much harder task. To challenge the immoral facts of society takes a heroism, a faith, an intelligence compared with which the fight with a secular philosophy is mere child's play. The latter can be done in the study, the former may cost us our bread and butter, our very existence, besides the study. And so far religion as a whole has failed to condemn the social iniquities of the age.

This recognition of religion's partial failure must not blind us to the fact that, in other respects, it has done things which we can never do without. In the individual life it enables us to achieve a character in which the higher triumphs over the lower. Furthermore, it strengthens us against the evils in nature and life by the faith that there is a personal God at the center of the universe. "Religion is the courageous logic which makes ethical struggle consist with world facts." As a result, the classes which suffer least from present social maladjustment, i. e., the country folks and the middle classes, are the ones where religion still has its strongest hold. Nevertheless, personal piety does not solve social problems. Faith and love have not endowed the church with social intelligence, and lacking this, the industrial masses have turned away from her. Instead of expecting anything from a God who seems to care so little for their well-being, they have accepted a materialistic world view according to which we live in a universe of brute force where only the fittest, i. e., the strongest, survive. The laboring men, being the most numerous, will be the strongest as soon as they are unified by organization, and in the inevitable class struggle they will eventually be the victors. Theirs is a philosophy which recognizes no moral or spiritual values and can, therefore, not produce a stable and permanent society. Even systems built on morality, but rejecting religion, seem to be ineffective. With the stoics, they led either to the Scylla of pride or the Charybdis of despair, and Bertrand Russell's "unyielding despair," of recent date, shows that the situation has not changed.

The author now proceeds to review the past and to point out what the church in its development has done with the religion of Jesus. This historical survey brings out the amazing power of keen analysis the writer is possessed of, and the range and definiteness of his information. The story he has to tell is a sad one, and although he naturally finds defects everywhere, his sharpest criticisms are reserved for the Protestant church; and in the Protestant church again, Calvinism is his bête noire. Calvinism has brought forth and suckled the pet sin of the age, *greed*.

The Roman Church, in spite of all its faults, had some moral idealism in its monkish orders, which kept up a stubborn conflict with social conditions. Here we have a St. Francis, as Christlike a person as ever lived. His ideal was indeed that of an ascetic, but "asceticism

is probably nearest to the real genius of religion and most adequate for the needs of our day." Then, the Catholic church always retained its spiritual independence from secular powers and the character of a world institution. Protestantism created the secular state and became subject to it. Its churches are national institutions, and the Lutherans, particularly, in their subserviency to the state, lost all influence on public life.

Niebuhr adopts the thesis of Max Weber, the German economist, taken over and elaborated later by Troeltsch (Soziallehren, see pp. 703, 710 ff.), that *Calvinism* is the *father* of *Capitalism*. While the ancient Greeks preferred a life of leisure and meditation, Calvin demands one of manual toil and commercial eterprise. Like the early Jewish prophets he saw in material welfare the blessing from above, he entirely disregarded the social note of the 8th century Jewish teachers. This religious sanction of material gain was a new thing in history. But it found a ready soil in the Protestant world. While the Lutherans despaired of conquering the world, the Calvinists were convinced of their ability to make it subject to individual initiative and moral ideals. Their most successful representatives in the new world are the Puritans. Troeltsch can quote many facts and opinions to show that the Puritan fight against sloth and luxury and their experience in the discipline of work has made them capitalistic eventually. Niebuhr, in this connection, mentions even Wesley, giving his well-known advice on money matters: "Make all you can, save all you can, give all you can!" It was Wesley's expressed opinion that religion producing industry and frugality, must necessarily produce riches also; and to counteract the evil effect of growing riches there is only one way: philanthropy, generous giving! Every one knows that there is no country where this philosophy is more generally held than in America. Religion pays, that is the burden of no end of sermons. There is no other country either where religion is more thoroughly at home than in ours, and, says Niebuhr, *when that is the case*, it has *lost its savor*. We believe in America that religion, the Christian religion at least, has the power to transform the world. The great brotherhood of the "Kingdom idea" preach that as their alpha and omega. Niebuhr, on the other hand, does not share this faith. Religion aims to *transcend* the world, not to transform it. Jesus was indifferent to the "business of earth." Happiness is to him founded on internal resources.

We are in a sorry state then. We live in a world largely made by Puritans, the capitalists in embryo. Adam Smith has become the unchallenged authority of the commercial world. Our religion promotes individual efficiency; our riches we consider heaven's blessing on our intelligence, morality, and industry. But we find that the pride of our life, our wealth, is at the same time our corruption; that it has produced in us the characteristic vice of capitalism, greed. Moreover, we find that this same wealth is founded on the economic enslavement of the masses. Our religion has so far seldom made us feel the enormity of our lapse from Christian ideals; but it has killed

the faith in the genuineness of our religion in the submerged millions. The strange thing is that so few can see the evil of our ways. Even the enlightened Liberal is often blind here. As Rauschenbusch used to say: "A Liberal in theology and reactionary in economics, is a frequent combination." Niebuhr puts it this way: The theological simplicity of Jesus has appealed more to the Protestant (Liberal) than his moral austerity."

If then Protestantism has so ignominously capitulated before the force of political and economic groups, how may the situation be saved? Where is there a way out? The Socialists see salvation in the socializing of industry, whereby the productive workers are made the owners and distributors of what they produce. This would create an economic environment in which morality would have a better chance of growth. The Christian Socialists while accepting the economic principles of Socialism, would enlist the cooperation of the church for the preservation of moral and spiritual values. The author agrees with neither the one nor the other. According to him help must come from such laymen as are entirely detached from the materialistic spirit and, at the same time, are experts in the social sciences: a combination, it would seem, of a St. Francis and a modern professor of sociology! Such a combination of spiritual and technical excellence might be hard to find. And even if there were more men of such type, we think they would have to exert, and preserve, their influence *through* an *institution*. The disciples of Jesus did that, and even the prophets of the O. T., although such severe critics of the church of their day, would have been forgotten if the church had not handed down their message. But if the church is an unfit instrument for social reconstruction, what other medium would take its place?

In a closing chapter the writer tries to coordinate his conception of man and his world in an adequate philosophy. This philosophy must necessarily be theistic. At the same time, it must do justice to the fact that stubborn and gigantic forces of evil seem to belie the belief in an omnipotent and kindly world ruler. A pantheism which drapes evil in the garments of the good, or a naturalism which denies the ideal cannot suffice. So the writer finds himself almost forced to posit a dualism of ultimate principles, reminding us of the "finite God" of Mr. Wells, and other post-war speculations. Philosophy will probably wrestle with the antagonism of the real and the ideal to the end of time. Meanwhile we have faith, and in it a power that not only transcends the world, but also transforms it. Whatever be the difficulties of theism, a dualistic philosophy would throw us back to where ancient Persia was.

The book, we may say without exaggeration, is written by one of the keenest minds the country possesses. And as the author unfolds his information, one does not know whether to wonder more at its extent or the complete mastery with which it is used.

Niebuhr does not write for the ordinary reader, however. He writes for the scholar. He packs so much into every sentence that it is at times even hard for the latter to assimilate it readily. It is

said that in religion the natural man must first become spiritual, and then natural again. So it may also be said in scholarship, that a student must first become a scholar, an expert; and then, laying off the heavy armor of the scientific equipment, walk lightly as the shepherd boy of old, fighting with weapons as simple as a smooth stone. Niebuhr could learn here from Rauschenbusch. R., when he appeared before the public 20 years ago, with his first book, astonished the world not only by his amazing command of the subject, but equally by the finished ease and popularity of his style. If our author will walk in the steps of the great prophet from Rochester, he will not only be admired, but also read by the larger number.

The Impatience of a Parson. A Plea for the Recovery of Vital Christianity by *H. R. L. Sheppard*, lately Vicar of St. Martin—in the Fields. Doubleday, Doran & Company. 1928. 227 pages, $2.00.

When we first saw this book and read in the advertisements that, at last, a bold voice was raised against ecclesiasticism in the Church of England, we thought it would contain a declaration of war on the Anglo-Catholic movement in that church. It is not that at all, however. The author does say that "the Roman church with all its merit is not and cannot be the chosen home of free men and women"; but his criticism is not directed against any wing of, or movement in the church. According to him the Church of England as a whole is in danger of wasting its strength on questions of an ecclesiastical nature and thereby losing a great moral and spiritual opportunity. Owing to the size and importance of this church, it could make a great contribution to Christendom. The hour demands of the church a plain *program* of *Christian living;* and so far the church has neither presented nor exemplified it. And, secondly, the pressing needs of the time require a *united church.* But the Church of England will not promote the cause of church union unless it abandons all claims of superiority.

Our time is in a critical stage. The war has destroyed our faith in the automatic improvement of society. Many feel with us that science and education are unavailing in the task of regenerating the world. Christianity alone can help, for it asks us to be true to our own ideals; it gives the power "to become"; it has the exhaustless personality of Christ. Or is, perhaps, the Galilean too great for us? It is indeed easier to fulfil the demands of the church than those of Christ. It is easier to accept the dogmas of the faith than to employ its ethics. Still the church that is only a devotional society will have no power nor courage for the task before us.

The church is an institution doubtless founded under the divine spirit. The individual cannot develop without its fostering care, nor its achievements and traditions be preserved without a permanent organization. Yet the church is only a means to an end; it must always be "subsidiary to the adventure in Christian living."

When is a church Christian? the writer asks. When its corporate ethical ideals are on the same level as those of the individual

Christian. The Christ of the Sermon on the Mount is the fountain and norm for our morality. It is not the church's business to develop a program of social reform. In the author's opinion, Christian individuals, loving, humble, sincere, courageous, reared in the spirit of the Son of man, will regenerate society.

Christ's teachings were chiefly of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. The writer here adopts the position of modern theology: Christ "dethroned the tyrant God of the O. T." God is not a punisher at all. He loves everybody and receives every penitent sinner without condition. (Paul's statement that we are justified *through* the *redemption* which is in Christ Jesus, is evidently a theological speculation only.) The most repugnant item of orthodox belief is to him the doctrine of everlasting punishment. Doubtless most of us sympathize heartily with him in this respect.

As to the question of church unity, the writer takes, for an Episcopalian, a bold stand. The Church of England must give up its love of status and prestige. The fundamental stumbling block, however, is its claim of apostolic succession. This belief, historically untenable, and spiritually preposterous, the Church of England is bound to set aside. He knows that that is a sacrifice so great that it would be almost tantamount to self-destruction. But he is fully aware that the church must go to the very limit of self-sacrifice. Without mutual self-denial the churches will never come together. And it must be borne in mind by his church that its opponents are the world, the flesh and the devil, not other churches.

In closing he enumerates a number of things which are fundamental if the recovery of vital Christianity is to be made possible. They are: The father-God of Jesus is the essential of theological belief; the church is an important means, not an end; no intellectual tests are to be imposed; no magic is to be attached to the sacraments; the ethical ideals of the Sermon on the Mount are practicable. Industrial autocracy and all war are to be anathematized. The current conception of Hell is un-Christian.

The Anglican Church should desire to remove every barrier to church union. The differences among the churches should not be ended but recognized as secondary. The Anglican Church while believing in episcopal government, should dissociate itself from the belief that the Apostolic succession is the test of the validity of a Christian church.

These propositions the author submits to his church in the hope that the coming *Lambeth Conference* of *Bishops* (in 1930) may see their way clear to accept the most important. This hope can only be fulfilled if the new archbishop (the present one is 80 years old) will be a "reformer, not a referee," as before. Under the circumstances, the book shows a daring and determined, yet sane spirit. There is little likelihood that it will sweep the bench of bishops out of its reactionary stolidity. But if it could by some kind of miracle, do something substantial, the cause of Christian unity and progress would indeed seem bright.

To Know Him. Five addresses by *Merton S. Rice.* The Abingdon Press, 1927. 100 pages, $1.00

These sermons, delivered as the Matthew Simpson Foundation lectures at De Pauw University, in 1927, show the author, the pastor of the Metropolitan Methodist Episcopal Church, of Detroit, in his natural self. Reviewer has had the privilege to hear Dr. Rice several times, and each time he was charmed with him. He has a winning personality, a spontaneous eloquence, and a most delightful and irresistible naturalness.

In this little volume he presents Jesus as the Man, the Teacher, the Friend, and the Savior. There is in the treatment of his subject, from start to finish, the human touch. Although speaking in a university, the author makes no attempt to dazzle by a display of learning. In fact, the sermons might have been held anywhere else and be just as adequate.

It is the gospel for the individual soul he preaches; the social gospel is not particularly his domain. But within his own sphere he is a master. His stories are a strong feature in his presentation. And whether he tells the touching tale of Silas Marner over again; or of the tug Iowa coming to port with 33 men saved from their storm-wrecked vessel; or of Mrs. Barney rescuing "Old Sal"—they are all good and told with simplicity and a precision of detail reminding, in its way, of the masters of the old Dutch school.

So, we say to the preacher, read Dr. Rice's books and you will lay in a stock of anecdotes at any rate, that will come in quite handy in time of need.

VOLUME 56. JULY 1928. NUMBER 4.

Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America

Motto: 1. Cor. 3, 22-23.
Πάντα ὑμῶν ἐστίν, ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ.

Published bi-monthly and entered at the post office at St. Louis, Mo., as second-class matter in December, 1898.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October, 1917, authorized on July 3, 1918.

CONTENTS

Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per year (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 9807 Cudell Ave., Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-18 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

VOL. 56. ST. LOUIS, MO. JULY 1928.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES FOR THE MODERN MINISTER

By Professor Philip Vollmer, Ph.D., D.D.

We are living in serious but great times. In the words of Schiller, "Old things are passing away, the times are changing; but out of the ruins of the old new life is springing." Modern civilization is at present slowly but surely passing through another of its great historical turning points towards a new social order. The world is in the throes of a tremendous social revolution, or its aftermath, partly of a bloody nature as in Germany, Russia and China, partly silent, as in England, India, Africa, France, Italy and the United States. These silent or thundering revolutions have accentuated old social problems and raised new ones. Everywhere, all classes of the people discuss the problems of the church and the changing order, of democracy and dictatorship, of the modern family and the youth movement, of nationalism and the international mind, of imperialism and extensive war preparedness, of the new woman and the old moralities, of the rise of the labor class and of communism. Men call these problems burning and pressing, and so they appear to all who have a mind trained to interpret the signs of the times.

In this new epoch of human history, which the World War has ushered in, the demand becomes louder every day, inside and outside of the Church, at home and abroad, that the churches should make a much larger contribution to world reconstruction than

hitherto, by a more fearless discharge of their peculiar mission as God's prophets to the nations, that is, by a stricter and more uncompromising proclamation of the social gospel in the sense in which Christ, according to the New Testament, taught it, so that the new civilization which at present is in the making may not only be new but also better and higher for individual and group life.

As all the perplexing problems with which the world is grappling are more or less of a social and economic nature, it follows that the churches must equip their ministers more adequately than hitherto for their part in the struggle, enabling them to discern and rightly interpret the signs of the times, to understand what it is all about, what the millions of men are agonizing for, what the church is to bless and what to condemn. Hence the great value and importance of an adequate study of the social sciences for the successful work confronting the minister of Christ's gospel in these modern times. For in order to proceed intelligently in the effort to Christianize the new social order, the leaders must know precisely what the old and dying order really is, what the new demands are, and what principles Christ urges for a better world. In the words of Rev. R. Todt, the co-laborer of Dr. Stoecker in Germany, "Whoever would understand the social question and would contribute to its solution, must have on his right hand the works on political economy, on his left the platform of socialism and before him the New Testament."

What Is Meant by the Social Sciences?

As distinguished from the groups of the natural, the philosophical, the historical, the linguistic, the theological and other sciences, we understand by the social sciences the whole group of studies which deal with men in their group relations, "socius" meaning comrade, companion. Like all sciences in this age of research and specialization, the social science group also has branched out into a network of chief- and subdivisions. Perhaps the best classification is that given by Blackman and Gillin in "Outlines of Sociology," as follows:

I. *Sociology.*—Social origins, social evolution, social psychology, social pathology, social control, history of sociology.

II. *Economics.*—Economic theories and institutions, taxation and finance, labor legislation, banking and monetary theories, industrial history.

III. *Politics or Civics.*—Political theories, national administration, diplomacy and international law, municipal administration, history of politics.

IV. *Ethics.*—Principles of ethics, social ethics, history of ethics.

V. *Anthropology.*—Ethnology, ethnography, archaeology.

VI. *History.*—Historical geography, history of institutions, and civilization.

VII. *Comparative Religion.*—History of religion, philosophy and psychology of religion.

It is of course not to be expected that the average minister of the gospel should be intimately acquainted with all of these branches of the social sciences, but with the following he should certainly have a "speaking acquaintance." (1) *Sociology,* which treats of the beginnings, the history, the structure, the institutions, the diseases of human society and their healing. (2) *Economics* or political economy, which treats of national housekeeping, that is, of the creation, distribution and consumption of goods and services necessary for the satisfaction of human wants. (3) *Politics* or Civics, which is the science of government treating of the origin, form and function of the state. (4) *Social ethics,* which is the science of public morality, dealing with social ideals and standards of group living.

The Importance of the Social Sciences to the Minister

First. An adequate knowledge of the social sciences will enable a pastor to discharge all the multitudinous duties of the Christian ministry with greater efficiency and more success. The function of the Church in this modern world is threefold:

(1) A Prophetic Function of Social Criticism. The Church is the conscience of society. As such she must maintain her sensitiveness to social injustice and her freedom to condemn it. She must therefore preserve her independence of all social powers, whether economic or political, and all conventions, theories or institutions, as well as of her own material interests (as an institution); she must eschew all alliances and commitments whereby her readiness to declare "Thus saith the Lord" might at any moment be impaired.

(2) An Evangelical Function of Social Inspiration, by holding up the ideal of the kingdom of heaven and its progressive realization in a Christian commonwealth and a commonwealth of mankind; by enlisting the solemn and joyous service of men as fellow-workers with God in His "new creation;" by quickening and hallowing all social impulse and endeavor with the motive of Christian love.

(3) A Pastoral Function of Social Sympathy, with special care, after the manner of Jesus, for the socially "unfit"—for the weak, the poor, the erring and the fallen. This feature, so prominent in the personal ministry of Jesus and the example of the early church, must never be allowed to become less conspicuous. The glory of the Church is to "preach the Gospel to the poor."

These functions the minister may discharge successfully only in the measure that he understands the principles and laws operating in human society. Effective Christian preaching is not the presentation of the truths of Christ's Gospel in an abstract and a haphazard manner but their application to the present concrete conditions and needs of men as individuals and in their social group relations. Hence, just like a successful farmer, a teacher of religion needs to know soils as well as seeds.

Secondly. Sociological knowledge will open the minister's eyes to those definite concrete conditions as do in a special manner hinder the success of the churches in their race-uplifting work. Among these conditions are the intense struggle for existence, the incessant conflict between capital and labor, and the estrangement of the masses, especially of laboring men, from the church. The great majority of working men do not care for the church, because they think the church does not care for them. The church, like the law, they say, is always on the side of capital against labor. This may not be true in the broad sense in which it is so often affirmed. But if the church had always plainly manifested the spirit of Christ, there would have been no occasion for the suspicion that she is partial to kid gloves and money bags. In the words of Rauschenbusch, "The actual results of our present social order are in acute contradiction to the Christian conceptions of justice and brotherhood." Present civilization is veneered, underneath which exists barbarism in its most malignant form. Sir Philip Gibbs recently said: "No man, unless he is drunk with optimism, can deny that the world is very sick, and it may be a sickness unto death." Proofs for this assertion abound everywhere. For example, greed for gain and power has turned legitimate commerce into wicked profiteering. The commercial giants traffic in human blood as they do in the inanimate products of the earth. Ambition for power and influence has caused politicians to juggle with the rights of the people, to prove unfaithful to their constituency, and to use public office for private gain. Ministers, especially of rich and fashionable congregations, have often apologized for these social wrongs, not so much because these servants of Christ and the Church were so exceedingly perverse, as because they were entirely ignorant of how "the other half" lives. A little wider knowledge of men and society would have given them larger and more generous sympathies.

Thirdly. The study of the social sciences will teach an intelligent minister that there are many ways to reach a desired end, and such insight may convince him that, as a rule, his peculiar contribution is to teach only the principles of righteous living, leaving the concrete measures of law and technique to general society and

the state. For equally good and clear-headed persons, while agreeing on a principle, may often disagree on the definite ways and means of carrying it into effect. For instance, the minister should on every occasion urge the abolition of poverty as a divine demand, based on the New Testament principle of equity and brotherhood; but when it comes to the question of "how", his suggestions should be given only as his personal opinions. He may favor state insurance and widows' pensions, while other equally good Christians may prefer corporation or group insurance. Again, the minister should preach that righteousness exalteth a people; but whether this ideal can best be realized by state ownership of the public wealth, or by enlightened private capitalism or by any other means must ever remain a matter of diversified opinion. Only let them be clear and definite principles which he proclaims and not glittering and hazy generalities. In the words of Professor Ely, "The church has often contented herself with repeating platitudes and vague generalities which have disturbed no guilty soul, and thus she has allowed the leadership in social reconstruction to slip away from her. It can, then, scarcely excite surprise that the labor movements have become materialistic and infidel." A phrase, "the simple Gospel," has recently been invented which according to the usual interpretation put upon it rather means an emasculated Gospel, a Gospel with one-half or three-fourths of its substance omitted, a Gospel which would keep Christians from concerning themselves about things like righteous business, fair elections, abolition of poverty, outlawry of war, etc. So when ministers hammer away at the sins of Egypt, 4000 years ago, and of Paris 4000 miles away, they are said to preach the "simple gospel"; but when they say the same things about affairs in America they are criticized for preaching politics (Vollmer, "New Testament Sociology," page 271).

Fourth. The history of the social movement will familiarize the studious minister with a number of serious lessons and warnings of which he should make frequent use in the discharge of his sacred duties. It will teach him that what is known as "Christian Civilization" is not at all identical with Christ's unvarnished Gospel of the Kingdom of God. Like a mighty river, Christianity, in its course through nineteen centuries, has been flowing through many lands and many epochs. And just as streams, in flowing, take on discolorations and accumulate sediments from the varied lands through which they flow, so Christianity has taken on discolorations from the various civilizations and philosophies through which it has flowed and has accumulated sediments from the varied organizations that have taken it in hand. It is right, therefore, that teachers of religion should critically ask, as they approach

modern Christianity, which is the clear water of life and which is the mud and silt.

Social history will also show the minister the deplorable fact that the ruling classes in past ages usually came too late with their offer of social and political concessions, thus inviting bloody revolutions, as in America (1776), in France (1789), in Germany (1848), and in Russia (1917). These facts will enable him to interpret correctly the present world-wide social unrest. It is not a specially wicked outbreak of "sin" and discontent, but a God-inspired movement of the oppressed classes demanding their rights, though their methods may often be accompanied by sin and selfishness. The present social movement simply marks another step upward in the moral development of the human race. As the English barons, in 1215, wrested some of their rights from absolutistic kingship, and the middle class in France, in 1789, triumphed over king, nobles and clergy, so since about 1848 the labor class is demanding its right to liberty, equality and the pursuit of happiness. The fact that the majority of the ministers take such an unsympathetic attitude toward the whole social movement can only be explained by the other fact that they lack knowledge of the social sciences.

History furthermore will reveal to the patriotic minister that the ruling classes have always used the church (and the church in most cases was blind enough to allow herself to be so abused) for the support of the conditions as they were and was ever ready to hurl sharp denunciations against "radical" men and parties. The result has been that all over the world millions of men and women are leaving the church, denouncing it as the "black police" for the ruling classes. In England the relation between the church and the working classes is somewhat better because all of the Christian churches have been more friendly to the working classes. Signs seem to indicate that the American churches will profit by history and follow the example of England. There is nothing inherently objectionable in the principles of the church which should repulse progressive men—just the opposite. The estrangement comes only when the churches and ministers permit themselves to be used as brakes on social progress. In that case the express train of social uplift will throw her aside, and the Lord himself may spew her out of his mouth. (Rev. 3:16). He has no use for a church which misrepresents him to the people and tries to serve God and Mammon.

Finally, a study of the history of social progress will teach the minister that many ideals of Christ's kingdom have already been realized, though the wrongs attacked seemed to be a part of the

very nature of man and of former civilizations, such as slavery, polygamy, autocracy, the American saloon, etc. This will kindle the minister's optimism as to the power and the possibilities of Christ to cast out other demons that still infest our modern civilization.

Fifth. From a more intimate knowledge of the best literature published by the advocates of the social gospel, the up-to-date minister may learn how and why the Church differs from organized socialism in her activity for the social uplift of the masses. Both agree as to the diagnosis of the diseases of modern civilization, and also as to the results to be reached. But they differ in spirit and method. Class hatred has no place in the ministrations of Christ's ministers. We must speak the truth in the spirit of Love. Love is a working principle not only for individual life and social life, but for all life. Love in the sense of good will, is the only thing that makes all things work together for good. "Love makes the home work together for good; nothing else will. Love makes the school work together for good; nothing else will. Love makes the factory work together for good; nothing else will. Love makes the nations work together for good; nothing else will. Love, and only love, will make industry work together for good; nothing else will. Everything else has failed. Law has failed, education has failed, labor unions have failed, science has failed, organization has failed, employers' associations have failed. In a word, every form of industrial organization based on force and selfishness has failed. Love, and only love, can solve our industrial problems and usher in a period of industrial peace and prosperity based on industrial justice." (Dr. John McDowell.) It is therefore true love to his rich brother and true love of country which should prompt a faithful and intelligent minister to make the ruling classes see that Christ's program alone will avert social disaster and bloodshed. For as in Daniel's day, the very men for whom the writing on the wall is meant can neither read nor interpret it. It takes a prophet of God to do that. And the church is meant to be that prophet.

The church also differs from organized socialism as to method. Radical socialism believes in miracles. It expects happiness, contentment, goodness and all social virtues to result from material comfort. But no material comfort can satisfy the restless soul within us and give us peace with ourselves and others. In the best social order conceivable men will still be filled with lust and ambition and be lashed by hate and jealousy. This is proved by millions who already live under such comfortable conditions as are urged by social reformers to be enjoyed by all. So while the socialized minister will, of course, work and pray for the kingdom of

social righteousness here on earth and now, in the form of a saved social environment, he follows Christ's method of bringing it about by stressing the demand: "Ye must be born again" (John 3:3). For the only effective ultimate solution of every social problem must lie in a change of mind and heart. The soul of all lasting improvement is the improvement of the soul. Of course! For the individual is the unit of society and enough of these units must be right before they can sustain right relations to one another.

Sixth. This accumulated knowledge of the social sciences will tend to make the minister a *better preacher,* because it will make his preaching and teaching adapted to the needs of the times, ("zeitgemaess"), instructive, inspiring and uplifting, whether it be done in the pulpit or in the Sunday school, or in occasional addresses before business men's gatherings, or in his literary work. Ministers often wonder why it is that sermons of past time pulpit giants, like Luther, Zwingli, Knox and others, had such a mighty effect on millions of men, while when read today they leave one unmoved. The secret is that those sermons were "timely", based on and colored by the actual conditions of the times, while modern preaching is to a large extent tame, theoretical, abstract, uninformed and not fitted to the times ("weltfremd").

Seven. Knowledge of the social sciences will also make the minister a *better pastor, adviser and leader* of his people and of society in general. Millions of the American people, especially of the educated and the laboring classes, are well informed on the various sociological theories. Already in our church membership, there are many kinds of social attitudes represented, and their number is on the increase. Now a minister cannot afford to make a laughing stock of himself and cast discredit on the cause of Christ and his Church and drive thousands away from her courts, by blind and bitter denunciation of the modern sciences and the social movements. Even when a minister favors standpattism on the social problems he should be able to defend his reactionism with intelligence.

Eighth. A knowledge of the social sciences will also make the minister a *better theologian* by enabling him to make the necessary and proper theological adjustments on the basis of new facts, clearer beliefs, stronger convictions and experiences and truer interpretations of the Bible. The essence of saving faith which is trust in God, is a matter of the heart and has remained the same in all ages, but theology is a matter of man's intellect, a feeble attempt to interpret the facts of the Bible and of Christian experience on the basis of the knowledge and spirit of the times. Like all other sciences, theology is therefore subject to constant changes and

necessary adjustments. There will therefore always be a new theology of the old faith. In this sense, Jesus, Paul, Augustine, the Reformers, Wesley, Schleiermacher and others were all new theologians, making new theological adjustments. The same work is quietly but effectively going on at present. Walter Rauschenbusch, in his last book, "A Theology for the Social Gospel," says "We have a social gospel. We need a systematic theology large enough to match it and vital enough to back it. If theology stops growing or is unable to adjust itself to its modern environment and to meet its present tasks, it will die. Many now regard it as dead. The social gospel needs a theology to make it effective; but theology needs the social gospel to vitalize it, for it is a permanent addition, to our spiritual outlook and its arrival constitutes a stage in the development of the Christian religion." Knowledge of the social sciences will assist the minister to make these theological adjustments intelligently.

Nine. Knowledge of the modern social sciences and of the actualities of modern life will also enable an increasing number of well trained ministers to take a direct hand in bringing about concrete reforms. The captains of industry and some labor leaders often object to the social declarations of the church on the plea that the church is not competent to discuss economic and industrial questions. Unfortunately, there is much truth in this, and our seminary boards and faculties should make a note of it; but in its generalization the charge is not true. There have always been and there are today thousands of ministers who know what they are talking and writing about on political and economic questions. Yea, owing to their better trained minds and their wide reading and observation, some ministers know much better what at bottom is ailing society than many "practical" business men. History and recent facts, such as the famous report on the Steel Trust, prove this contention. Hence, while as a rule, it will not be the task of the minister to tell his people how to run their business, it may often become desirable, if not necessary, that the minister should have something positive to teach touching the well-being of society. The inculcation of general principles may not always be enough. Instance the case of Nathan before David. It becomes necessary for the preacher sometimes to say, "Thou art the man." The command, "thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" sometimes needs more explicit explanation, as it did once, at least, in the history of Christ. But in order to give such explanation a good deal of ethical and especially sociological knowledge is required.

THE BENEDICTION, A BLESSING OR A PRAYER?

PROFESSOR JOHN O. EVJEN, PH.D.

II

APOSTOLIC BENEDICTIONS

We now come to a class of benedictions called Apostolic, embracing what is sometimes called the *Salve, Vale, Votum, Pax,* etc., generally greetings taken from the letters in the New Testament, verbatim or with slight modifications. In making the transition from the treatment of the Mosaic or Aaronic Benediction to the so-called Apostolic, it may be well to quote from Lyman Coleman's *The Apostolical and Primitive Church* (1844). The author defines the sacerdotal benediction as a brief prayer to God for his blessings upon the people by one who has been duly set apart to the service of the ministry, as an intercessor with God in their behalf. Perhaps Coleman stresses the intercessory factor too much, but he is right in saying that the intercession was the exclusive act of the "clergy". In commenting on more modern usage, especially the usage in the Lutheran Church, where, in his opinion, only the ordained clergyman is authorized to perform the rite, saying "The Lord bless you" etc., instead of "The Lord bless us," as the layman is expected to say, Coleman mistakingly deduces just what some Lutherans themselves deduce—that the minister, according to Lutheran thinking, stands in the place of Christ to bless the people in his name. Coleman thus makes Catholics and Lutherans, alike, the adherents of a "delusive dogma" which has changed the character of the Christian Ministry. He is, indeed, right in censuring the hierarchic development of the ministry, but he is too much a follower of the letter to be able to interpret the Aaronic benediction wholly in an evangelical way. He is therefore happy to make the claim that there are no indications of the use of sacerdotal benedictions, in the Jewish and prelatic sense of the term, in the religious worship of the Churches (p. 416). He asks, with some reason, "Was it not the superintending providence of God which graciously withheld the Apostles and primitive Christians from adopting a rite, rendered obsolete by the atoning work of the High Priest of our profession and susceptible of unutterable abuses, as the subsequent history of the church clearly shows?"

Commenting on the Apostolic benediction, he says, it is in spirit and in import altogether unlike the Aaronic benediction *of the Jews* or the *prelatic blessing* of the bishop and priest. It is, he says, nothing more than a brief *prayer,* a benevolent desire offered with solemnity unto God for his blessing upon the people. Coleman

is right in making this distinction between the two, provided the Aaronic blessing is given, received, and understood with the limitation imposed upon the Old Testament. But he fails to see what Reinhold Seeberg has noted, that to the liberated Christian the entire Bible is gospel, and to the legalist, the entire Bible is law. Therefore, it escapes him, that the Aaronic benediction, though occasioning abuse and misunderstanding, through its literal rendition in the assembly of public worship, can be interpreted and can be used spiritually, in the way Luther intended it to be used, when he introduced it into the Reformation liturgy.*

Wishes of Prayer, Wishes for Blessings

It is not necessary, in this treatise, to list all of the apostolic benedictions. It is sufficient to consider those that are more or less in common usage today, with references to other Scripture passages which aid in explaining them.

We shall first consider Phil. 4: 7, called the Vale, or Pax (English: the Peace), often read at the conclusion of the sermon in some churches; and often at the conclusion of the entire service, in other churches. We repeat what has been said before, that the

---

* Luther, making Numbers 6, 24 seq. a part of the Liturgy, certainly had no intention of reviving the Old testament priesthood. He was not any more hesitant about laying a deeper spiritual meaning into this formulary than was St. John in using the logos concept, which the Apostle found, but greatly modified. This free attitude of Luther is noted especially in his explanation of the commandments in the Small Catechism. In explaining the fourth commandment (Honor thy father and thy mother, etc., the fifth commandment according to the Reformed), he embraced the whole field of social ethics. In explaining the third commandment (fourth, Reformed), to keep the sabbath, he says nothing about the Sabbath of twenty-four hours. He takes the commandment to mean, in its spiritual interpretation, that our entire life should be "Sabbath." Our fear and love of God, which is religion, should reveal themselves in such a way that we "do not despise his Word and the preaching (proclamation: whether by the mother, teaching her child about God, or the minister teaching a church, or, say both, living the Christian life as a preaching example) of the Gospel. This is the negative side. The positive side of keeping this commandment consists in deeming the gospel holy, by hearing and teaching it willingly.

The word used by Luther "leren" meant in his day to teach, as well as to learn. The Norwegian translation "laere" has the same twofold meaning. The Norwegian-Danish Epitome of the Catechism, by Pontoppidan (1737), as well as the Stavanger edition of 1896, translated "hear from others and teach others." This corresponds to the First Latin Translation of the Small Catechism, in 1529, *Enchiridion Piarum precationum: "libenter tum audire ab aliis tum alios docere."* The somewhat later Latin text of Sauromannus reads "discamus." This is quite natural, for it was a translation for school pupils. Reu, in "A new English Translation of Luther's Small Catechism," p. 23, prefers the interpretation "learn." However, Luther would hardly be satisfied with the mere passive function; he would also include active teaching, which need not always be public.

verse in question, as rendered in the Bible, is not a benediction, a wish or prayer, but a statement in the indicative: "The peace of God . . . *shall keep* your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus." Usage has made this reading common, "And now may the peace of God," etc. Likely it is due to the Latin rendering: *custodiat,* instead of custodiet, in the Vulgate.

According to the "Alterbog" (1902) of the Norwegian Lutheran Church in our country, the sermon concludes with the words of Paul: 2 Cor. 13, 14. This is prescribed in the Norwegian Liturgy, which calls 2 Cor. 13, 14 "det apostoliske Oenske"; that is, the Apostolic *wish:* "The work of the pulpit, we read, concludes with the apostolic wish, whereupon 2 Cor. 13, 14 is said by the pastor. The "work" in the pulpit comprises, beside the sermon, the general prayer and the Lord's Prayer. The Norwegian and Danish Lutheran churches, as a rule, have no lectern. They have most of their prayers read from the pulpit, while the collects and epistles are generally read from the altar.*

Before studying 2 Cor. 13, 14 more carefully, let us turn our attention to briefer, kindred forms.

In Romans 16, 20 we read, "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with you." The greatest New Testament scholar of our day, Th. Zahn, calls this a "Gebetswunsch." Professor S. Odland, his greatest pupil in Norway, calls it "Boenneoenske," both terms, literally translated, meaning a wish of prayer.

1 Cor. 16, 22 is classified by C. F. Georg Heinrici (Meyers Kommentar) together with Rom. 16: 20, 24; Gal. 6: 18; Phil. 4: 23; 1 Th. 5: 28; 2 Th. 3: 18 as the Apostle Paul's most current "Schlusswunsch" (Concluding wish). Odland calls is "Velsignelsesoenske" (wish of blessing).

G. Wohlenberg in the great Zahn Commentary, commenting on 1 Thess. 5: 28, makes a quite similar statement: "As the writers of the Epistle (Paul, Sylvanus, Timothy) began with a "Segenswunsch" (wish of blessing), they also closed with a "Wunschformel": as Paul does in all his epistles, except for a concluding doxology to Romans. The shorter ones are Col. 4: 18; 1 Tim. 6: 21; 2 Tim. 4: 22; Titus 3: 15. The longer ones are 1 Cor. 16: 23, 24; 2 Cor. 13: 14; Gal. 6: 18; Eph. 6: 23, 24; Phil. 4: 23.

Paul Ewald, in the Zahn Commentary, calls Col. 4: 18 "The

---

* It is well for a congregation to see a face in prayer especially for circles that believe that the altar-ward prayer of the minister is a *religions necessity.* "Orientation" whether its origin is due to looking towards Jerusalem or towards the East, at public prayer, is an adiaphoron so long as it is not made a religious requirement. In thirteen ancient Catholic churches, in Rome, whose altars are on the west, the priest steps *behind* the altar and turns his face toward the congregation, towards the East. (Julius Böhner, Die Studierstube, Oct., 1922.)

grace be with you," a "Gebetswunsch." He calls Eph. 6: 23, Phil. 4: 23, Philemon 25 a "Schlusswunsch."

S. Odland calls Eph. 6: 23 "Velsignelsesoenske," and Rom. 1: 7 a "hilseoenske" (wish of greeting).

J. Chr. Petersen, or Norway, calls, Heb. 13: 22 ("The grace be with you all") a wish: Ivar Welle, also of Norway, finds that 1 Peter 5: 14 ("Peace be unto you all that are in Christ") is a wish. Likewise 3 John 15 and Jude 3.

In agreement with these German and Norwegian exegetes on the issue in question, are Danish and English exegetes like Skat Roerdam and Fr. Torm, both of Denmark, and W. Robertson Nicoll, of England. Roerdam calls, e. g. Rom. 16: 20 "velsignelsesoenske." Torm, commenting on 1 Tim. 6: 22, says: In place of the usual Greek epistolary greeting, Paul always concludes with a "Velsignelsesoenske," expressed by "Grace." Most often it reads, The grace of (our) Lord Jesus Christ. But in Collossians, Ephesians and the Pastoral letters we read "grace" without any added genitive. The Expository Greek Testament, by W. Robertson Nicoll, vol. III, 118-19, says: "He (Paul) always ends with a *prayer* that Christ's grace may rest on his correspondents."

In summary: All the authorities quoted, agree in calling the "apostolic benedictions" wishes or prayers. But the wish is the father of prayer. Even the custom of removing the hat when greeting "Good morning" is a testimony to the connection of prayer. I wish the person whom I greet, a good morning. It means, I pray that he may have a good morning. In praying, I remove my hat. The custom is better exemplified in European countries, where men when greeting, remove their hats for men as well as women. A later, but inadequate explanation of the origin of the custom harks back to the age of chivalry.

The most complete apostolic benediction is, however, 2 Cor. 13, 14, already in part dealt with. In the Norwegian liturgy, as it is seen, it is expressly called the apostolic wish. Odland and Bugge of Norway call it a *wish* for blessing, Weiss and Heinrici, of Germany call it "Segenswunsch." In most cases these benedictions have *no verb*. Hence the optative of *to be* is supplied. Schlatter is an exception, making the verb indicative: "The grace of our Lord . . . *is* with you." Even if Schlatters translation should be preferable, which it is not, the indicative form would signify a declaration. But no declaration works *ex opere operato*. There must be *boni interiores motus* present in the recipients.

Philologic Support

That blessing by man is a *wish or* prayer is clearly shown in philological research. In Preuschen-Bauer's splendid Gr.-Deutsches

Woerterbuch, the word for blessing—*evloge*—is treated at length. Its first meaning, to praise and give thanks, lists Mat. 14: 19 (thanks for fish and bread) : 21, 26 (praise and thanks for the bread of the Lord's Supper) ; Mark 6 : 41 (thanks for bread and fish) ; 14 : 22 (for the Lord's Supper). Luke 24: 30 refers to giving thanks at meal. The Jewish housefather in saying grace (thanks) broke bread. 1 Cor. 14: 16 is a prayer of thanks.

The second meaning of "evlogeo" is, blessing by wishing God's gracious power upon a person: Luke 24: 50; Luke 1: 28; Rom. 12: 14a; Heb. 11: 21; 1 Cor. 4: 12; 1 Pet. 3: 9. "Evlogeo" is also used in the sense of wishing one propitiousness: Luke 2: 34; Matt. 21: 9; 23: 39; Mark 11: 9; Luke 13: 25.

The third meaning is: To remember someone with benevolent deeds, God or Christ being the subject. Heb. 6: 14; Eph. 1: 3; Gal. 3: 9; Acts 3: 25; Luke 14: 2; Eph. 2: 1; Matt. 25, 34.

This dictionary also speaks of "blessing things," referring to Mark 8 : 7 ; Luke 9 : 16 ; 1 Cor. 10 : 16. The latter alleged meaning is not scriptural, and does not receive its support in the Jewish thinking of the day, which was legalistic, but really above the idea that a particular sanctity could be transferred to a thing by blessing. It does, however receive support in the Hellenistic-mystic thought of the day. But, were men like Paul trained in the law, and converted to the gospel of liberty, affected with the leaven of religious Hellenism? Hardly.

The summary of the second part of our treatise is this: Apostolic benedictions are wishes or prayers; and "evlogeo," aside from the doxological application, generally means: to wish grace for somebody. Only God or Christ can bless in the real sense, though Christ himself often petitioned the Father for blessings upon somebody. No mortal, not even an Apostle, can do more than to pray for the blessing which God alone makes effective. Thus the position taken in the first part of this treatise, has been confirmed by the second part, clearly indicating the correctness of Dr. Thuemmel, of Jena,* who well says:

"No priesthood has a monopoly. God alone blesses by imparting his spiritual power. The blessing by man is only a prayer to God in behalf of others. A Christian *blessing* is always a *prayer*."

III

Consecration, or the Benediction of Things

There is a third kind of benediction, the blessing of things. What does it mean? Mark 8 : 7 speaks of Christ's blessing the fish at the feeding of the Four Thousand. But the marginal reading "excharistesas" would indicate that Christ gave thanks, or said

* R.G.G., Handlungen, christliche II, p. 1841.

grace. B. Weiss translates: gave prayer of praise. Luke 9: 16 is taken by Bauer to mean "consecrate"; this is possible only when a concession is made to the influence of Hellenistic-mystic thought. Zahn, strong in Patristic Greek, says, Christ used a prayer of "thanks."

But what does "evlogeo" mean in the passage, "The cup of blessing which we bless?" (1 Cor. 10: 16). Did Christ consecrate the cup, or its contents, so as to give to it a power or attribute which it did not possess before? The explanation of this verse by Heinrici (Meyer Kommentar v. 304 seq.) and by Ph. Bachmann (Zahn Kommentar Vii) is too scholastic, and too much under the spell of the "How" at the Colloquy at Marburg of 1529, since the "What" is the all important thing; perfect fellowship with the entire person (soma) of Christ. Illuminating is the explanation by A. Schlatter: "The Church of Corinth indeed has no altar and performs no act of sacrifice at its gathering for worship. But it needs, in its gatherings, the cup of blessing, which is called thus because the praise of God has been said over it, and because it is filled and is drunk in order that God be praised. After it has been filled with wine, we bless it, says Paul. It is expressly designated as a gift of God, who bestows his grace on the congregation that it might praise him." **

This explanation, entirely scriptural, is as far removed from the idea of a mystery cult as it is from the scholasticism of an Occam. It harmonizes with the fact that "evlogeo" *** in the language of the New Testament can not be interpreted as "dinglich." One of the greatest Protestant theologians, Karl Heim, of our day speaks with tremendous earnestness against the "dingliche", the popular-vulgar magic of the Roman Catholic Church, with its cult of hierarchic benediction and consecration.

The Catholic View

Heim attacks the two pillars on which the entire edifice of Rome's vulgar superstitious magic rests: first, the consecrated priest; secondly the sacred room, the sacred act and the sacred object.

As to the priest, he says, the Catholic believes that plenary powers of a religious nature can be transferred to a human being, through "dingliche" means, like the Chrisma of the bishop; and through acts of anointing and consecrating. The naive Catholic believes that the benediction received from a Catholic priest, just consecrated, is most powerful. It is as if he were surcharged with celestial electricity; the naive Catholic has faith in the popular

**Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament II, 262.

*** Our word "eulogy" is derived from this Greek word.

saying that one ought to ride a horse to death in order to receive the first blessing of a newly consecrated priest. A freshly consecrated priest coming to his home is received as a superterrestrial being.

Against this massive superstition, Heim asserts that a pastor has no religious plenary authority, which all other living members of the church can not have. The official ministry, indeed, is needed: though not for religious reasons, but for the sake of a division of the work. It is a ministry without a super-earthly nimbus.

As to the sacred room, act, and object, Heim continues: The Protestant conception of the church teaches that God is no longer localizable, is no more spacially transcendent, but is transcendent in that deeper meaning, which reveals him only to a frightened conscience. Therefore, there is no longer in existence a sacred room, a sacred place where God is more present than at any other place.

There exist no longer any sacred objects which could be charged with such powers of grace that they would bring me closer to God by touching them, kissing them, or eating them as medicine.

There are, therefore, no more any sacred acts, which can be performed with these sacred objects and can mediate to me, *ex opere operato,* powers of grace.

To sum it up, "this entire conception belongs to the Pre-Copernican age of religion."

Applying this, Heim finds that Luther, in his contention at Marburg, departed from his spiritual conception as applied to the other sacrament, by advancing the dangerous statement that also unbelievers, in the elements of the Lord's Supper, receive the body and blood of Christ, though to their judgment. As soon as it is even conceivable, says Heim, that a human being, without belief in the Word, receive a heavenly food, we again have the sacred object, the consecrated host, charged with super-earthly forces. One can then come in contact with the heavenly powers in another way than solely by the conscience under the impression of the Word—namely by eating a host. Thus far Heim.

This is good Paulinism, and in agreement with Schlatter's explanation of the cup of blessing it brings out, forcibly and scripturally, that we cannot bless objects or consecrate persons so as to transfer to them a certain sacred quality.

The Meaning of "Consecration"

We do nevertheless speak also in the evangelical Church of blessing objects. But, as E. Chr. Achelis says, this blessing is to be understood in a twofold meaning:

"First, this benediction is the separation of the object from its

* Karl Heim, Das Wesen des evangelischen Christentums, 1926.

common use, for an exclusively cultic use by the Church. It is always connected with the first employment of it at a gathering for public worship. As long as this use of the object continue, the objects, so used, are *res sacrae*. As soon as the cultic use ceases, they are no longer termed *res sacrae*. They are not desecrated or profaned, if they are withdrawn from use at worship and are returned to ordinary use. One may speak of desecration and profanation only when these objects, set aside for divine worship, are used in a frivolous way for acts devoid of the worshipful.

"Secondly, the benediction of objects take place, without exception, *by metonomy*. The objects are mentioned, but the persons using them are meant. This moment becomes very prominent in the Evangelical forms of consecration. For example, the consecration of a *cemetery* is not intended (as ancients believed) to keep away the demons from the graves, but it is a solemn act whereby the field is taken in use as a cemetery and given over to the living that they piously protect it. A cemetery is not desecrated by ceasing to be used as a cemetery, and, later, by being put to another use. It is desecrated (figuratively spoken) when it is used impiously, e. g. as a grazing field. The same holds true of the consecration of church edifices, of *vasa sacra, etc.* The objects do not receive a supernatural power, which distinguishes them from other objects, or vessels. The benediction really means that the objects are put to use in worship."*

The Catholics regard consecration as a higher degree of benediction. Luther, as is well known, rejected very decisively benedictions and consecrations applied to inanimate objects; as did also, in express terms, the Church order of Braunschweig (1528) of Goettingen (1530), of Soest (1532), of Nassau (1536) of Kurbrandenburg (1540), of Kalenberg (1542), and of Pfalzneuberg (1543).

G. Rietschel expresses himself in much the same way as Achelis. It is evangelical, especially Lutheran teaching that "consecration *never has operative influence* on the consecrated object. It does not impart to the objects supernatural power and sanctity . . . The consecrated objects remain entirely unchanged in their natural quality." Rietschel prefers the word "dedicate," which means: to give up *as to* sacred or serious use, while consecrate means to set apart as *itself sacred*.

Verba Testamenti

Rietschel, in a true evangelical spirit, also rejects the widespread belief that the words of Institution (verba testamenti) said over the elements of the Lord's Supper have the power to effect a unio sacramentalis. He criticizes this conception as unevangelical and Romanizing. In 1521 or 1522 Luther rejected the blessing of the elements by the priest and ascribed to the words of Institution the character of a proclamation of the Gospel. The minister, he said, should turn to the people, not to the altar, while reading the words of Institution. He should not whisper or mumble them as if they produced a magical effect, but sing or say them aloud that the congregation might hear that the Lord's Supper and what it implies is "for you," for the repentant people in the congregation.

A prayer at the Lord's Supper is of course not to be rejected.

* Achelis, Lehrbuch der praktischen Theologie, 3rd ed., I, 512. Compare also Achelis, Benediktionen in Herzog-Hauck P. R. E. II; also his abbreviated summary in the New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, II, 49.

The name "eucharist" implies that the Lord's Supper was accompanied by much prayer and praise. But the nature of such prayer would be much like that of a prayer said at meat. Saying grace (gratiam) at the table, means to give thanks, but the table prayer is not *applied* to the food. It is a thanksgiving and a petition to God that he will cause the food to be for our blessing. The table prayer "Bless us and these thy gifts," in Luther's Catechism, is a prayer *super elementis* but not *super elementa.* The Formula of Concord correctly, but perhaps unconsciously, states that the reciting of the words of Institution takes place *"super pane et vino."* The words are not applied to the elements themselves, which, if they were, would be expressed *"super panem et vinum"*** Rietchel quotes Th. Harnack as rejecting the postconsecration of elements as "an echo of the Roman practice, which early awakened the idea of a magic effect of the Word."† The chief thing about the Lord's supper is the gospel proclamation, not a consecration.

Dedicating a Church Edifice

As to consecrating, or rather, dedicating churches, Luther's sermon, 1544, the first held in a newly built chapel in Torgau, is a model of evangelical thinking. He chose as his text, Luke 14: 1-14, which refers to keeping the Sabbath holy, and he said: "What does it really mean to keep a day, an hour, or a week sacred? First, to do something so as to accomplish some thing sacred—above all to proclaim God's Word in purity and holiness. Secondly, to do something in order that others may hear the Word of God, learn it and so help that it be proclaimed and preserved in purity. That is the right way of keeping a day of celebration holy, to consecrate the place or church, as we are consecrating this house.

Not a ceremony, but "putting the shoulders together" . . . and "therewith to bless and consecrate ourselves and others," is the right kind of church dedication. Then the church will be a blessing for many." The church edifice does not receive a supernatural divine power by being consecrated any more, than a cem-

---

** G. Rietschel, Lehrbuch der Liturgik II, 546.

M. Schian, Grundriss der Praktischen Theologie, p. 66: "The recitation of verba testamenti does not mean 'consecration'. This concept is antagonistic to evangelical thinking."

The Homberg Church ordinance, 1526, prohibited, what it called, the *superstitiosae benedictiones* of bread, wine, water, salt, etc., and recommended in its place a table prayer, but not as compulsory. A. L. Richter, Die Evang. Kirchenordnungen (1846) p. 61.

To the point are the statements of *Franz Rendtorff,* Die *Geschichte des christlichen Gottesdienstes* (1914) p. 47. This work is a classic on the history of Liturgics. Very fine is also Fr. Flemming, *Die treibenden Kraefte in der lutherischen Gottesdienstreform* (1926).

† Rietschel, Lehrbuch II, 549. Achelis, Lehrbuch der Praktischen Theologie I, 443.

etery. The opposite, catholic, view is unable to comprehend that, what God has created, is, without anything further, also suitable for use in public worship. Luther, indeed, spoke of a consecration of what has been created, through Word and prayer, but he added: From this the objects created receive no new power, but are confirmed in their previous power. ††

What applies to blessings here, also applies to the blessings or benedictions of marriages, or to the ordination of ministers. To Luther both acts were acts of prayer.* This treatise would be entirely too long, if it should add a detailed discussion of these acts to what has already been presented.

Benefits

But, the reader may ask, Does one then derive nothing from benedictions? Yes, but not *ex opere operato.* Benedictions are the Word of God, whether they be prayed or sung. As the hearing of any Word of God can bring blessings, so the hearing of a benediction may be elevating and bring much comfort. But, again, not *ex opere operato.* Moreover, the benedictions are not a higher kind of Word, an especially sacred utterance, said by a specially sacred man in a specially sacred place; nor are they a lower kind of Word of God. But they are to be used as all other Word of God, not as a relic of the thinking that demanded exorcism, nor as the remnant of still lower conception, for example of that of the king of Moab, who wanted blesses and curses made according to order. No hierarch can curse, no hierarch can bless.

There is, after all, "an actual fulfilment of the consecration, which is a prayer." It takes place, first, in order that many human beings may derive spiritual blessings from, and in the object consecrated. The place into which a good man enters, is "consecrated." But places and churches can not be holy, and cannot bless . . . Churches can not be consecrated, in the real sense. We can only pray for the persons who come to it to teach and to be taught, to sing and pray and listen.

Calvin in discussing churches, or what he often called temples, said: "There is need of great caution, lest we either consider them as the proper habitations of the Deity, where he may be nearer to us to hear our prayers,—an idea which has begun to be prevalent for ages, several ages—or ascribe to them I know not what mysterious

---

†† Luther's Werke. (E. A.) 25,378. Schian, Praktische Theologie, 192.

* In 1921 when the Lutheran bishop of Reval was consecrated, Archbishop N. Soederblom spoke as follows: When we blessingly lay our hands on your head, it means that honest hearts in Sweden, Finland, Lithuania, and Germany, as we here in your dear country Esthonia *offer ardent intercession* for you and the church of Christ which you have been solemnly asked to serve. Kyrkohistorisk Arsskrift, 1922, p. 332.

sanctity, which might be supposed to render our devotions more holy in the Divine view. For, since we are ourselves true temples of God, we must pray with ourselves, if we wish to invoke him in his holy temple. But let us, who are directed to worship the Lord "in spirit and in truth," without any difference of place, relinquish those gross ideas of religion to the Jews or pagans. There was, indeed, anciently a temple dedicated, by Divine command, to the oblation of prayers and sacrifices: at that time the truth was figuratively concealed under such shadows. But now having been plainly discovered to us, it no longer permits an exclusive attachment to any material temple. Nor, indeed, was the temple recommended to the Jews that they might enclose the Divine presence within its walls, but that thy might be employed in contemplating a representation of the true temple. Therefore Isaiah and Stephen have sharply reprehended those who suppose that God dwells in any respect "in temples made with hands."**

This attitude is that of Luther also. But Lutheran evangelical circles, having, from the start, a generous appreciation of the natural expressions of life, as shown in the free composition of the hymn over against the paraphrased psalm; of the New Testament themes of a composer like J. S. Bach over against the martial Old Testament themes of Haendel; of the love of that art which dares make likenesses also of things "that are in heaven above and of things that are in the earth beneath," number millions of "plain folks" who are devoted to church customs, which many others would pity or mock. But these customs they do not regard as *opus operatum*. The peasant cannot always express in words his religious experience. He therefore understands the visible word better than the clear speech of the theological, more immediately than does the trained and reflective mind. At the tolling of the evening bell, he hears the sound of peace and prayer. For him custom is a religious language. Hence, as is often seen in Europe, the handkerchief delicately folded around the hymnal, hence the quiet visits to the graves around the church, hence a courtesy before this or that object in church, the stealthy tear at confirmation, the signing of the cross on forehead, breast,—and, not to forget, the benediction.

But this evangelical peasant does not do his thinking *per opus operatum,* and he has not surrendered the belief in the general priesthood of believers. Not he, but his "consecrated" brother, even in modern schools of prophets, may get his ideas crossed and experience a relapse that makes the words of the Danish Church historian J. Oskar Anderson sound utterly strange to him; "Consecrations do not transmit to objects peculiar powers or virtues. Their sacredness depends on their use."

It is often difficult for such a mind to react favorably to the clear-cut evangelical statement made about sacramentals by the well-known statesman and jurist Richard W. Dove (d 1907):

** Thüemmel, Art. Handlungen, Christliche, R. G. G. II, 1841; Calvin, Institutes, translation by John Allen II, p. 116; (Book III, Chapter xx, section 30).

"The evangelical church knows no sacramentals. It employs neither consecration nor benediction even for the immediate instruments of divine worship such as would impart to them any property of sanctity. But according to Church law these objects deserve special respect and are specially protected against abuse. A solemn *dedication* is usual for churches and cemeteries, by means of a *prayer of benediction* . . . As to the setting-apart of particular objects (pulpits, *vasa sacra*, organs, baptismal font), it was held sufficient by a Conference of representatives of the evangelical-Lutheran Church government, 1856, that the local clergyman, on the first occasion of the use of the object in question address a few appropriate words to the congregation, and then ask God's blessing upon the employment of the object.

"In regard to the benedictions for objects of every day use, the older Protestant ordinances declared expressly against them on account of the danger of superstition."*

The reason for this difficulty of comprehension is due to sub-evangelical conceptions of the universal priesthood and to exalted views of priest, ceremony, and dogma.

A minister, or priest, in whatever capacity he functions, "can be for another man facing eternity nothing more than a brotherly *counselor* and *fatherly interceding friend.* He can not influence his eternal fate through the pronouncing of sacred formulas and through sacramental acts." These words, of Karl Heim, one of the most prominent systematicians of our age, apply not only to the Roman priest; for the priest is also found in Protestant circles. The priest in many Protestant sects has a still more dangerous power than in the Roman Church . . . Protestantism is the only religious form in the history of the world that no longer needs the priest, pontifex, to bridge the way between God and the soul.**

As the interceding friend and the counselling brother, the minister becomes something else than a master of ceremonies. Ceremonies have their place; and Saint Augustine has said: Without external ceremonies it is impossible to serve religion (Libr. ix contra Faustum). But, be it noted, here ceremonies are not made identical with religion itself, but are regarded as a more or less necessary means for keeping up public worship. "A certain man has said, 'Religion itself begins just exactly where ceremonies cease.' To reach the goal, certain means are necessary; they must, however, not be confused with the goal. But this, only too often takes place among people, not alone in the papacy, but in the evangelical Church. It is the mistake of the ministry, when it neglects to lead the church to a reasonable service, which, because of abuse, need not be deprived of necessary means."*

---

* Dove, Article, Sakramentalien, Herzog-Hauck, P.R.E., 17, 391.

** Heim, Das Wesen des evangelischen Christentums, 94 seq.

*Erich Pontoppidan, Collegium Pastorale Practicum, writen 1757. Ed. 1850, 464.

Religion is fellowship with God, not ceremonies, which, being of various kinds, may indirectly help or injure the cause of religion. For this reason, also the dogma of technical theology may aid or harm. The dogma has its place. But it is wrong to make it a part of Revelation, as a sponsor of hierarchy or supporter of mystagogy. One of the greatest church historians of modern times, H. Boehmer —in criticising Erik Petersens view that the incarnation of the logos is continued in the sacraments and the speaking of the logos in dogma, denies Petersen's contention that the ultimate character of Revelation is expressed in dogma, and that faith is submission to dogma. Boehmer's answer is, that, according to the evangelical view, dogma is not a part of Revelation, but only an endeavor, conditioned by the times, to establish and confirm the right understanding of Revelation. The object of Revelation, as also Luther says, is not dogma, but revelation, or better, God, who has been revealed in Revelation.*

The minister, the dogma, the ceremony, the Word itself and the response of the people: all this appears in public and private worship. We sometimes call this worship service. But our Sunday service is not *our* service of God. It is his service of us. God serves us, gives us the Gospel, which is proclaimed to us and by us, in preaching and reading, song and prayer. All this is for us. To call this a sacrifice to God is not evangelical, says M. Schian. The congregation does not pray in order to sacrifice to God, but in order to be edified in fellowship with God.**

The division of the "service" into the sacrificial (we come to God) and the sacramental (He comes to us) is confusing. Worship is conversation with God, in which He imparts to us and we receive, with praise and thanks. Christianity's outstanding characteristic is to receive what God gives. And thus, at the close of every service, we receive what we always receive from God in the field of nature, of history, and of individuality: through creation, redemption, and sanctification.

In other words, we receive, if we are willing to receive, the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit.

We pray for this blessing upon ourselves and others. But God alone blesses.

---

* H. Boehmer, Gesammelte Aufsaetze, 276.

** M. Schian, Die Reform des Gottesdienstes und die hochkirchliche Bewegung, 1922, 18.

Karl Eger, in Evangelischen Gottesdienst und kirchliche Kunst (1924): "Worship does not exist for God's sake, but for the sake of *man*, that something be imparted to him by God."

OUR CONFESSION

By A. A. Susott

In 1840 the German Evangelical Church Union of the West, to which our Evangelical Synod traces its origin, was organized. Since the organizers themselves, and the people they ministered to, were of German origin, the object of the Association readily defined itself as the care of German immigrants. Immigration at that time was at its height, and those coming into a strange new land, among strange people, needed the help, the encouragement, and the checks, of the church. As the association of churches grew, its purpose remained the same, for there were the immigrants themselves, and there were their many children to be ministered to in a language they could understand. The German Evangelical Synod, as it came to be called, thus filled a very real need in the history of our country. It was bound to the Evangelical church of Germany with the close ties of history and blood relationship. Its confession too was the same. Our Church is thus a very natural growth. The existing need was seen, and so far as possible, met.

When the shadows of the great war were upon us, immigration from Germany naturally ceased. The gradual process of changing from the German to the English language was hastened, and the church as such lost a great measure of its importance, through lack of readjustment. Immigration has never again become important, nor will it ever become a factor that needs to be seriously reckoned with on the part of the Evangelical Synod. Our country is no longer the land of unlimited opportunity it once was, restricted immigration will henceforth always be with us; and the proportion of our own people is so large that those coming in can very readily be assimilated. Today we seem to be without any distinct objective, and we are earnestly seeking a field in which we will be able to make a distinct contribution to American church life. Unless we find such a cause, to which the Synod can give itself heart and soul, the church will die of inanition.

In what particular way shall our Synod spend itself in service? Certain talents it has received from the Lord of the Church—what use will it make of its gifts? Certainly it has been instrumental in helping to bring about a realization of the need of Religious Education. It has made a very real contribution in this particular field. Today, however, we are failing dismally to adjust ourselves to changed and changing conditions, and our program of religious education has become antiquated. It is certainly inadequate to meet the needs of our people today. Our catechism is in great need of satisfactory revision. It contains not only actual errors of teach-

ing, but fails to emphasize certain important truths, such as social service. We may, and it seems to me we should, reassume our place in the field of religious education. Here again, the vital lack of an all-embracing purpose makes itself felt. Our whole work is suffering because of this lack of objective. We still find many churches interpreting their task as teaching to read and write the German language. The church dare not deviate from the one essential—to teach the Word of God. Many of our older people, to whom German is the mother tongue, the natural mode of expression, still need to have German preached to them, and need to hear the vital truths of Christianity in their language. But to impose it upon our younger people in the name of religion is little short of sacrilege.

Realizing the lack that is upon us, many of our prominent ministers and a few of our laymen are urging a union with some other church body. The trouble is interpreted as being one of comparative size. Because we are small; that is why we are not in a position to make a contribution. Yet other church bodies, some of them large, are also failing. It is not merely a matter of size—I question whether it is a matter of size at all. Given the right kind of a contribution and we are sure to grow. No question will be solved by merging with any other body—it will perhaps defer the evil day, but the end will still be in sight. It is better to be honest, to face the question squarely, than to try to avoid the issue. The only thing that is carrying us on today is the previous impulse—and we are feeling its power ebb. What we need is a new impulse, and such an impulse can come only with the adoption of an adequate goal.

Loyalty of men to one another derives its vitality from the value of the common aim. It is this common aim which our own denomination is in danger of losing. Many different pet theories are being advanced, but there is a very real lack of that unity of the spirit which should be the characteristic of our church. We could undoubtedly merge with the Reformed Church, or with the Lutheran Church. We would thus lose our identity, which, under present conditions, would scarcely seem a loss. And yet it would be a loss, not only to ourselves but to the church at large. For it would mean that we would give up our motto of the unity of the spirit in order to have a corporate union with some other church body. Only a measure of modesty restrains me from saying, some other inferior church body. For, while we today are undoubtedly inferior to many denominations, our ideals are actually of the highest, and it would be a step backward if we were to unite with any body which holds only a portion of the accepted truth. It is necessary and inadvisable for our Synod to take a step which would be

an actual retrogression. When we move, let us move forward, not backward.

One of the greatest contributions that some church is going to make in the near future, is a confession which ignores the opinions and traditions of men, and centers again in Christ. I would to God that our own church might have the vision and the courage to make that contribution. It sometimes seems to me that we have been called into being for that very purpose, that God intends for us to make that vital confession which reaffirms the teaching of the Apostles to the exclusion of all else—believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved. I venture to say that a majority of the pastors of our Synod today are unfamiliar with either Luther's or the Heidelberg Catechism, and have only a vague acquaintance with the Augsburg Confession. The people of our Synod are even farther from a knowledge of these books than are the pastors. To be worthwhile, a confession ought to be understood by the average man and woman within the church. As it is, most church confessions are a sort of smoke screen which effectively mystifies not only a large number of the clergy, but blinds a large number of the laity as well.

Our present confession is wholly inadequate to our needs. It does not embody our principle of unity of the spirit. It does not stress the importance of Holy Scriptures, placing the emphasis rather upon the interpretations of them as they are found in the Lutheran and Reformed church bodies. The only reference we are to make to them as the foundation of all we believe and hope is in regard to the point in dispute. Our confession has no present significance. There was a time when in contrast to the spirit of contention such a confession did indeed have a very real importance. Church history has left that time far behind, and we are not so in much in need of a settlement of some dogmatic problem as we are in need of a vital confession of our faith and hope. Actually, we subject ourselves to the limitations and the criticisms of the Lutheran and Reformed church bodies, without benefitting by their advantages. Why should we, as a strictly American product, bind ourselves to a confession of faith which is meaningless to most of our people and very hazy to many of our ministers? What is there holy in the traditions of men that makes it impossible to restate the truth with special reference to the needs of today? Surely, if Christ were here today, he would take us away from the traditions of men and lead us back to the simple Word.

We should develop our own confession. We stand alone. We are not a branch of some other denomination. We are one of the few really independent church bodies in America today. We are

a natural growth. When the time comes for us to take a step forward we may do so without consulting other affiliated bodies. We have no past achievements that bind us to that past. Certainly we have achievements, but these spur us on, rather than inviting us to rest. Our one time duty has been taken from us by force of circumstances, and another is needed to take its place. The duty was well done—but we cannot rest upon the past, we need to look forward to the future. We have today an important, double duty —to meet the present and future needs of our people. And as our forefathers, the founders of our church body, saw a distinct need and met it courageously, so we of today should see the need and meet it with the same foresight, the same vision, the same courage, as did those who were responsible for the founding of our Synod.

I have been asked to discuss the Confession of our Synod. This I seek to do, not by an analysis of our present Confession, but by the attempt to show what we believe and how that belief might be effectively stated. What should a Confession include? The one I have in mind would emphasize the following points. First, a recognition of the reliability, sufficiency, and authority of the Holy Scriptures. Second, an acceptance of the Fatherhood of God. Third, a dependence upon Jesus as "The Way, the Truth, and the Life," without whom none can come to the Father; and a realization that the experience of Jesus is essential to Christian living. Fourth, an absolute reliance upon the Holy Spirit as the Teacher and the source of Power in the Church, and in the individual Christian life.

In regard to the first of these: a recognition of the reliability, sufficiency and authority of the Holy Scriptures, it seems to me that this says all that needs to be said about the matter. That the Holy Scriptures are reliable is undisputed today by anyone who has made a careful study of honest Bible Criticism. There is very little doubt attaching to the validity of the scriptures being what they pretend to be—the Revelation of God to his people. That they are sufficient is a matter of personal experience. If we live by their teaching, we discover that they are adequate to the purpose of helping men find God, and of inspiring to better living. All worthwhile devotional literature has its origin in the Scriptures. There might be some objection to the last, the authority of the Holy Scriptures. Yet I would feel it essential to our Confession. We need something to cling to and something to build on, there must be authority somewhere for the church and the individual Christian conscience—and where shall we find it if we reject the Holy Scriptures? I therefore submit the following in regard to this first part: "The Evangelical Synod of North America recognizes and

accepts the reliability, sufficiency, and authority of the Holy Scriptures as the only infallible guide to Christian faith and life."

The second of these should stand without argument. God is the source of all life, and in that sense, he is the Father of all. It is true that many of the human race deny or reject that Fatherhood. While God is indeed the Father of all, not all men are his children. As Jesus himself says when he rebukes the Pharisees—"Ye are of your Father the devil." At the same time, God stands as a Father with open arms, not only waiting, but urging all his children to come to him. His heart goes out with a Father's love, even though many are unresponsive. In recognizing God as the Father of all, we would naturally recognize our obligation to our fellowmen, it would make social service, mission work, and all forms of service to our fellowmen of any race, color or creed, a brotherly duty. We therefore suggest the following: "The Evangelical Synod of North America acknowledges the universal Fatherhood of God, and prayerfully assumes those duties which arise out of this fact."

Probably the third point of the confession would be most open to argument, and from two sides. The one would say that our confession says too little leaving too much room for explanation and definition, which might weaken the paragraph, and the other that it says too much, not allowing the freedom which should prevail in the Evangelical Church. Personally, it seems to me to strike the balance pretty evenly: A dependence upon Jesus, the Son of God, as the way, the truth, and the life, without whom none can come to the Father; and a realization that the experience of Jesus is essential to Christian living. I have purposely refrained from further definition of what is meant by "Son of God." To me is self-evident that he was born in accordance with the story of Matthew and Luke, and as John intimates in his first chapter, and as it seems to me that Mark emphasizes by his insistence upon His Glory. At the same time, it is not for me to deny the possibility of Christian life and experience to one who might have difficulties with the Virgin birth. That he is the Son of God is the essential thought. We would need to recognize his own claim to be the Way, the Truth, and the Life, especially so since it has been proven that there is no other way. Dr. E. Stanley Jones in his book "Christ at the Round Table," brings that fact out very clearly and forcibly. And as regards the last we are learning, almost too late it sometimes seems to me—that all writing, all instruction, all evidence is in vain unless there be the personal experience of Jesus Christ. Just what form that experience will take in the individual life is not certain, for Jesus is as endless in the variety of his manifestations as is the individual; that there will need to be a real, vital experience of the

Christ before there can be Christian living is sure. We might seek to express this thought in this way: "The Evangelical Synod of North America realizes its dependence upon Jesus, the Son of God, as the Way to the Father, as the Key to all Truth, and as the source of a redeemed Life. It sees in the personal experience of Jesus the only possible motive and power to Christian living."

Fourth, an absolute reliance upon the Holy Spirit as the Teacher and the source of Power in the Church, and in the individual Christian life. It is this Holy Spirit which reveals Jesus to us. A personal experience of Jesus is dependent upon the action of the Holy Spirit within us. It is this third person in the Holy Trinity who tears aside the veil of the material giving us the spiritual capacity that enables us to see Jesus, and God in Jesus. He it is that transforms the life, by enabling us to realize the constant presence of Jesus in our midst. We could perhaps use this as our confession: "The Evangelical Synod of North America relies absolutely upon the working of the Holy Spirit in the individual and in the church, to produce Christian life. It depends upon him as Teacher, Counsellor, and Guide."

The entire confession of faith would then be as follows: "The Evangelical Synod of North America recognizes and accepts the reliability, sufficiency, and authority of the Holy Scriptures, as the only infallible guide to Christian faith and life. It acknowledges the universal Fatherhood of God, and prayerfully assumes those duties which arise out of this fact. It realizes its dependence upon Jesus, the Son of God, as the Way to the Father, as the Key to all Truth, and as the source of the Redeemed Life. It sees in the personal experience of Jesus the only possible motive and power to Christian living. It relies absolutely upon the working of the Holy Spirit in the individual and in the Church, to produce Christian life. It depends upon him as Teacher, Counsellor, and Guide."

This form of the Confession is of course rudely hammered out. To be of any value, it would need to be restated by such as have a finer sense of language than I. At any rate, it seems to embody the essential points of a Confession which can be commonly read and understood, it does not subject the supreme authority to a subordinate place, and it does point to the foundation of the church. It would be well for us to clear away the rubbish of opinions and return to the original source of Christian faith and life. We need, and that badly, a confession which every layman of any intelligence whatever, can understand and make his own. I do not believe that that substitute offered herein for our present confession is any deviation from the position of the founders of the Synod. Rather it seems to me to embody their principles. There is, however, lit-

tle hope on my part that this suggestion will be discussed as it should be. There is even less expectation that there will be any agreement on the part of our pastors. And there is no hope that a confession, stating in all simplicity the confession of the Evangelical Synod of North America, will be adopted.

But the day is coming when the church is going to have to strip itself of all excess baggage, when, like the sprinter, it will have to travel light in order to win the crown. It would be a happy day if our own church body could assume the leadership in such a movement. We would then be showing that spirit of unity which is essential to the church of Jesus Christ. Jesus, in his high-priestly prayer, petitioned "That they might all be one." It is our catering to the feuds and to the traditions of a bygone age that is retarding that process of becoming one today. Our own inheritance and our tradition did run contrary to this spirit—have we the courage and the conviction to keep it so? Through its new constitution the Synod is endeavoring to enter into a new period of service and growth. It needs only the vitalizing touch of an adequate, simple statement of what it believes to enable it to enter into the proposed inheritance. It needs a confession which is at the same time a creed to which every member can intelligently subscribe, and the truth and sufficiency of which, is the common experience of every follower of the Christ.

Die Ritschlsche Theologie.*

Von Professor Dr. R. H. Grützmacher.

I.

Um die Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts erfolgte ein außerordentlicher Umschwung im geistigen Leben. Die großen Systeme des deutschen Idealismus, sonderlich die Hegels und Schellings, verloren allen Kredit und Glauben. Man hielt es nicht mehr für möglich, auf spekulativem Weg den metaphysischen Sinn der Welt oder gar das Wesen Gottes zu erfassen. Die Gottes- wie die Geisteswelt schien für die menschliche Erkenntnis verschlossen. Aber auch auf dem Weg religiösen Fühlens und mystischen Erlebens im Sinn Schleiermachers wollte man sich nicht mehr Gottes bemächtigen. Das religiöse Leben befand sich in starkem Niedergang; denn die religiöse Erweckungsbewegung mit ihren kräftigen inneren Erschütterungen hatte ihre Kraft verloren. Das Interesse wandte sich von der Philosophie und Religion, der Metaphysik und Theologie ab. An ihre Stelle traten die **Naturwissenschaften, Soziologie und die exakt betriebene Geschichtswissenschaft.** Dazu nahmen praktisch-soziale und politische Bewegungen das öffentliche Interesse in Anspruch. Das Bedürfnis nach Weltanschauung und Lebenseinstellung begann mehr und mehr die aus der modernen Naturwissenschaft erwachsende Naturphilosophie zu befriedigen. Der Entwicklungsgedanke, der in der Hegelschen Philosophie die Wurzel einer idealistischen Weltanschauung war, wurde jetzt von der Naturwissenschaft übernommen, in ihrem Sinn mechanistisch-gesetzlich umgeformt und zur Ausdrucksform einer monistischen Weltanschauung. War bei **Darwin** — der englischen Geistesart entsprechend — noch eine große Zurückhaltung in der Verwendung des Entwicklungsgedankens für eine Natur- und Geistesphilosophie zu beobachten, so glaubte in Deutschland Häckel ihn zur Lösung aller Welträtsel verwenden zu können. Dieser **Monismus,** der schon einen stark materialistischen Anstrich trug, wurde vielfach durch eine Wiederbelebung des reinen **Materialismus** noch überboten. Es wurde schon früher festgestellt, wie Strauß und Feuerbach sich allmählich dem Materialismus zugewandt hatten; neben sie traten Männer wie Moleschott, Vogt, Büchner in weitverbreiteten populär-philosophischen Werken. Besondere Erfolge erzielte der Materialismus in seiner Anwendung auf eine Reihe einzelner Gebiete. In der sozialistischen Geschichtsphilosophie erschienen die materiellen Bedürfnisse und Schöpfungen als die treibenden Kräfte, durch die auch die geistigen Gebiete einschließlich der Religion und

---

* Mangelnden Raumes halber ist ein Artikel über die „positive Vermittlungstheologie" (Beyschlag, B. Weiß, Dorner, J. Müller usw.) zurückgestellt worden. Editor.

des Christentums in ihrer Entstehung und Entwicklung entscheidend beeinflußt wurden. In den sozialen Kämpfen hatten die materiellen Ziele und Werte auf allen Seiten das Uebergewicht gewonnen. Auch im politischen Leben drehte sich alles um greifbare Macht. So wurde neben dem theoretischen der praktische Materialismus zu einem Grundelement der Lebenseinstellung.

Durch diese Veränderung im Geistesleben der Zeit hatten Religion und Theologie ihre Stütze in einer idealistischen Philosophie und einer weitverbreiteten Metaphysik völlig verloren. Die mit ihnen verbundene ältere liberale Theologie wurde darum in den Zusammenbruch der Hegelschen Philosophie hineingezogen. Der herrschende theoretische und praktische Materialismus schloß aber überhaupt die Existenz der Religion aus. Ihr Ende schien gekommen zu sein und erst recht das der Theologie als Wissenschaft. Da ergab sich eine Wendung in der Philosophie, die einen Ausweg auch für die Religion und Theologie darzubieten schien. In der Philosophie erhob sich nämlich der Ruf: **„Zurück zu Kant!"** Er wurde gehört, ein **Neukantianismus** bildete sich. Dieser interpretierte Kant ganz im Sinn eines Positivismus der theoretisch jede Metaphysik ablehnt, dafür aber eine praktische Ethik aufstellt, an die sich religiöse Postulate anhängen lassen. Nach dem Neukantianismus ist von Kant die Unmöglichkeit jeder Metaphysik und damit auch die völlige Unerkennbarkeit des Wesens der Dinge zwingend erwiesen. Wir können nur erkennen, daß wir nichts zu erkennen vermögen. Das gilt vor allen Dingen auch in Bezug auf die Gotteserkenntnis in positiver so gut wie in negativer Richtung. Aus theoretischen Beweisgründen und Spekulationen darf das Dasein Gottes weder bejaht noch verneint werden. Gott ist eine Größe, mit der die Philosophie und Wissenschaft nicht das Geringste zu tun haben. **Philosophie als Welt- oder gar als Gottesanschauung ist theoretisch unmöglich.** Wissenschaft im strengen Sinn sind nur die **Einzelwissenschaften.** An ihre Spitze tritt die mathematische Naturwissenschaft mit ihrer kausalen Methode, ihren Berechnungen und Gesetzesfeststellungen. Der Neukantianismus lehnt es aber auch ab, aus der exakten Naturwissenschaft eine monistische oder materialistische Naturphilosophie und Weltanschauung abzuleiten. Denn diese sind ebenso metaphysischer Natur wie die idealistischen Systeme und bedeuten eine Grenzüberschreitung hinsichtlich des der theoretischen Vernunft gezogenen Spielraums. Neben der exakten Naturwissenschaft wird nur noch eine Geschichtswissenschaft anerkannt, die sich aber von aller Philosophie fernzuhalten hat. Sie darf nur aus den Quellen geschöpfte Einzelresultate erarbeiten oder allenfalls den Naturgesetzen ähnliche Geschichtsgesetze feststellen.

Neben und völlig getrennt von der theoretischen Vernunft tritt im Neukantianismus **die praktische Vernunft, die es mit dem**

sittlichen Handeln zu tuen hat. Ihr Inhalt wird wesentlich im Sinn des geschichtlichen Kant verstanden. Jedem menschlichen Wesen ist ein kategorischer Imperativ eingeboren, der ohne Rücksicht auf andre — besonders eudämonistische — Motive unbedingte Pflichterfüllung gebietet. Diese Pflicht trägt zunächst das formale Merkmal der Allgemeingültigkeit in dem Sinn, daß die den Einzelnen in seinem Handeln leitenden Grundsätze für alle Menschen verbindlich sein müssen. Dann aber gewinnt die Pflicht den doppelten materialen Inhalt, daß wir unser geistige Persönlichkeit der Natur gegenüber behaupten und uns in gegenseitiger Achtung mit allen Menschen zu einem Reich der Geister verbinden sollen. Der einzelne Mensch vernimmt nicht nur selbständig in seinem Innern diesen kategorischen Imperativ, sondern er besitzt auch die Fähigkeit, ihn aus eigener Kraft zu verwirklichen. Trotz der aus der Natur kommenden bösen Hemmungen ist der Mensch doch von sich aus fähig, in Freiheit seine sittlichen Pflichten zu erfüllen. Auf praktischem Gebiet besitzt der Mensch nach der kantischen Ethik nicht nur die **Autonomie, sondern auch die Autarkie des sittlichen Handelns.**

Die Religion kommt weder für die Begründung noch für die Durchführung der Ethik in Betracht. Vielmehr kann sie nur die Kraft der sittlichen Gebote stärken und bestimmten sittlichen Postulaten die Erfüllung zusagen. Religion wird darum von Kant definiert als die Erkenntnis unsrer Pflichten als göttlicher Gebote. Der religiöse Mensch stellt hinter seinen freien Willen zur Pflichterfüllung noch das Gebot Gottes und stärkt dadurch jenen. Nach Kant hat das sittliche Handeln selbst ohne jede Rücksicht auf Erfolg oder Glück zu geschehen. Aber im Menschen liegt doch auch der Anspruch auf Glück, und die sittliche Weltordnung erfordert, daß die Tugend belohnt werde. Diese Verbindung von Tugend und Glückseligkeit erfolgt aber in dieser Wirklichkeit nicht und wird von der Naturordnung nicht durchgeführt. Infolgedessen postuliert Kant einen jenseitigen Zustand der **Unsterblichkeit,** in welchem dieser Ausgleich von Tugend und Glückseligkeit vollzogen wird. **Gott** ist dann diejenige Größe, die diese Verbindung stiftet. **In seinem moralischen Gottesbeweis gewinnt Kant Gott und Unsterblichkeit als sittliche Postulate.** Damit ist aber durchaus nicht gesagt, ob Gott und die Unsterblichkeit auch unter dem theoretischen Gesichtspunkt der metaphysischen Wahrheit tatsächlich existieren. Der Neukantianismus verfolgt besonders eine Linie bei Kant, die der Philosoph **Vaihinger** in seinem zwar erst spät veröffentlichten, aber schon viel früher konzipierten **„Philosophie des Als ob“** unterstrichen hat. Danach sollen wir uns sittlich so verhalten, „als ob“ Gott und Unsterblichkeit existierten. Ja selbst wenn Gott nicht existierte, würde die theoretisch falsche Gottesvorstellung doch ihren praktisch-sittlichen Wahrheitswert behalten: „Auch Kants berühmter

moralischer Gottesbeweis ist nur eine Als-ob-Betrachtung zu praktischem Behuf — wenn Du sittlich handeln willst, so muß Du so handeln, als ob ein Gott, als ob Dein Gott Dir das befohlen hätte."

Soweit die Neukantische Philosophie überhaupt auf die **christlichen Einzeldogmen** und auf die kirchliche Entwicklung einging, stellte sie beide ganz unter moralische Gesichtspunkte — nach dem Vorbild von Kants Behandlungsweise in „Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der bloßen Vernunft." **Jesu Bedeutung ist eine ausschließlich moralische;** die Kirche oder wie man lieber sagte das Reich Gottes ist eine Gesellschaft unter Tugendgesetzen zur sittlichen Einigung der Menschheit, die Reformation eine Bewegung zur Förderung innerweltlicher Ethik.

Der Neukantianismus schließt mithin jede theoretische Metaphysik und Weltanschauung idealistischer, materialistischer, religiös-theologischer Prägung aus. Er legt alles Gewicht auf das aus eigner Vernunft und Kraft erfolgende sittliche Handeln, das die Sicherstellung des Geistes gegenüber der Natur in der eigenen Persönlichkeit und die geistige Gemeinschaft mit allen Menschen zum Ziel hat. Aus der Sittlichkeit können religiöse Postulate wie Gott und Unsterblichkeit abgeleitet werden, die aber nur unter dem Gesichtspunkt des praktischen Wertes, nicht ihrer theoretischen Wahrheit angesehen werden sollen. In der extremsten Ausführung des Neukantianismus werden die religiösen Vorstellungen als praktische Werte behandelt, trotzdem sie theoretisch falsch sind. Er berührt sich hier mit dem anglo-amerikanischen Pragmatismus, in dem alles Gewicht auf das Handeln und seinen Erfolg und nicht auf das Erkennen der Wahrheit gelegt wird.

II.

Unter den Einflüssen dieser geistigen Situation entstand und entwickelte sich die **Ritschlsche Theologie.** Das Maß der direkten und bewußten Beziehungen zu dem Neukantianismus ist bei den verschiedenen Vertretern der Ritschlschen Theologie ein differentes und zwar bei dem Meister ein loseres als bei Einzelnen seiner Schüler. Hier aber kommt es wesentlich auf die Gesamterscheinung des Ritschlianismus an und der Hervorhebung derjenige Züge, die ihn mit der Zeitphilosophie verbanden.

Ritschl lehnt zwar im Prinzip jede Verbindung von Theologie und Philosophie ab, erklärt aber dann doch in dem ersten geschichtlichen Band seines großen Werkes: **„Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung"** (1. Auflage 1870 ff.; 3. Auflage 1889 ff.): „Kant bietet noch jetzt für die richtige Grundidee des Christentums den unverrückbaren Maßstab dar. Er bringt die Erneuerung der sittlichen Weltanschauung der Reformation." Allerdings lehnt **Ritschl das Ueberwiegen der Moral über die Religion bei Kant ab. Dagegen**

ist er mit diesem ganz in der Ablehnung einer theoretischen Metaphysik gerade auch in Bezug auf die Gotteserkenntnis einig, da eine solche an der praktischen Bedeutung Gottes für die menschliche Persönlichkeit und deren Selbständigkeit gegenüber der Natur uninteressiert sei. „Eine rein theoretische uninteressierte Erkenntnis Gottes ist nicht als die notwendige Voraussetzung der Glaubenserkenntnis zu erstreben." Die Religion ist vielmehr nur einer solchen Weltanschauung geneigt, die dem persönlichen Geist seinen Wert gegenüber den Hemmungen der Natur und den Naturwirkungen der menschlichen Gesellschaft erhält und bestätigt. Das aber tut die Kantische Weltanschauung. Darum sucht Ritschl durch Vergleich und Anschluß an das Kantische individuelle und soziale Lebensideal einen Wahrheitsbeweis für das Christentum zu liefern: „Der christliche Gedanke der Versöhnung ist an dem Gedanken des sittlichen Reiches Gottes zu erproben, in welchem Kant rein philosophisch den Endzweck der Welt erkennt. Sofern die Idee der Versöhnung diese Probe besteht, wird aber der wissenschaftliche Beweis für die Wahrheit des Christentums vollzogen." Während Ritschls Schüler Julius Kaftan diese Idee weiter ausführte, hat **Ritschl später selbst jeden sich an eine Philosophie einschließlich derjenigen Kants anlehnenden Beweis fallen gelassen.** Er zog sich vielmehr auf den Satz zurück: „Der wissenschaftliche Beweis für die Wahrheit des Christentums wird überhaupt nur in der Linie gesucht werden dürfen: Wer den Willen Gottes erfüllen wird, wird erkennen, daß Christi Verkündigung wahr ist (Johannes 7, 17)." Dementsprechend hat die christliche Theologie auf sich gestellt nur den christlichen Gedanken von Gott und der Seligkeit des Menschen im Reich Gottes unter praktisch-ethischen Gesichtspunkten darzustellen. Infolgedessen sind alle die Elemente aus dem überlieferten Dogma und aus der traditionellen Religiosität auszuschalten, die keine unmittelbare Bedeutung für jene Gedankenreihen haben. **Ritschl beseitigt oder drängt ganz in den Hintergrund alle die altchristlichen und reformatorischen Dogmen, die seiner Meinung nach nur metaphysischen, aber nicht ethischen Charakter tragen.** So verschwindet die Trinitäts- wie die Zweinaturenlehre. In der Gottesvorstellung wird der Begriff der Absolutheit bekämpft, nicht minder die Eschatologie aller metaphysischen Merkmale entkleidet. Wie Ritschl das intellektuelle Element aus der Thelogie zu entfernen suchte, so nicht minder das **gefühlsmäßig-mystische** in der Religion. Er fand es besonders im Pietismus und in der Erweckungsbewegung herrschend. Er übte an ihm Kritik in seiner „Geschichte des Pietismus" und ging dem mystischen Element ablehnend auch da nach, wo es — wie in der „unio mystika" — in den Altprotestantismus eingedrungen war.

Stellte Schleiermacher in der Religion das Gefühl in den Vordergrund und verband sie darum mit der Kunst, Hegel und die ältere liberale Thelogie den Intellekt und verknüpfte sie darum mit der Metaphysik, so Ritschl den Willen. **Infolgedessen vollzieht er eine Ethisierung des Christentums in der Linie Kants.** Aber im Unterschied zu diesem will er doch die Ethik nicht geschichtslos rational begründen, sondern in der geschichtlichen Offenbarung in Christus wurzeln lassen. Dadurch gewinnt die Ritschlsche Theologie deutliche Zusammenhänge mit dem Altprotestantismus und mit dessen gleichzeitiger Erneuerung in der konfessionellen, besonders der Erlanger Theologie. Aber die altprotestantischen Prinzipien bei Ritschl werden doch immer wieder durch die Tendenz zu einer neuprotestantischen Ethisierung zurückgedrängt.

III.

Quelle und Norm für die authentische Kenntnis der christlichen Religion sollen nur die **biblischen Urkunden** sein, welche der Stiftungsepoche des Christentums nahestehen. „Die Urkunden der wirksamen Offenbarung sind die Bücher des Neuen Testaments." In der Beurteilung der Echtheit der neutestamentlichen Urkunden ist Ritschl durchaus konservativ. Als Maßstab für die Kanonizität der neutestamentlichen Schriften nennt er ihren engen Zusammenhang mit dem Alten Testament „ihre authentisch alttestamentliche Bedingtheit" im Unterschied zu den vom Heidentum schon beeinflußten Nachapostolischen Schriften. **Ritschl verbindet das Christentum nur mit dem Judentum;** er isoliert es viel stärker von der allgemeinen Religionsgeschichte und von der natürlichen Gottesoffenbarung, als dies in der altkirchlichen, altreformatorischen und auch in der neueren konfessionellen, geschweige denn in der religionsgeschichtlichen Theologie geschehen ist. **Ritschl ist demnach im Prinzip durchaus Biblizist, aber er deutet** — wie das der zweite, dem biblischen Stoff gewidmete Teil von „Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung" zeigt — **die biblischen Gedanken exegetisch stark um.** Er entleert zum Beispiel den Begriff des Sohnes Gottes seines metaphysischen Gehaltes, erklärt den Zorn Gottes für ein „heimatloses wie gestaltloses Theologumenon" und entfernt alle objektiven Elemente aus den Stellen über den Versöhnungstod Jesu. Die religiöse Erfahrung kommt für ihn nicht als Quelle der christlichen Wahrheit in Betracht. **Er ist ein Gegner der Religionspsychologie.** Sein extremer Biblizismus, der sowohl Religionsgeschichte wie Religionspsychologie ablehnt, hat ihn aber nicht an einer weitgehenden Umgestaltung der wichtigsten biblisch-altprotestantischen Lehren gehindert.

Aus dem **Wesen Gottes** ist nicht nur der Zorn, sondern auch **die Heiligkeit zu entfernen,** denn „der zureichende Begriff von Gott

ist in dem Begriff der Liebe ausgedrückt." Gott ist nur Vater und nicht Richter. Auch durch die Sünde des Menschen ist seine Gesinnung keine andre geworden. Er ist vielmehr als liebender Vater stets in gleichem Maß bereit gewesen, den Menschen bedingungslos zu vergeben und sie wieder in seine Gemeinschaft zuzulassen. Nachdem aber die Menschen in der Sünde ihre Ehrfurcht und ihr Vertrauen Gott entzogen, haben sie sich ihrerseits von Gott das falsche Bild einer Heiligkeit gemacht, vor deren Zorn sie sich fürchteten. Infolgedessen wagten die Menschen Gott nicht mehr zu nahen. Um den Menschen diese irrtümliche Vorstellung zu nehmen und die absolute Gewißheit der stets gleichbleibenden Vaterliebe eindrücklich zu machen, offenbart sich Gott in Christus. **Die Offenbarung in Christus hat mithin nicht den Zweck, ein neues Verhältnis zwischen Gott und Menschen zu begründen, sondern nur den Menschen die stets gleiche Liebesgesinnung Gottes zu offenbaren.** Zugleich aber erscheint in **Christus** der sündenfreie sittliche Mensch in vollendeter Gestalt, der im Vertrauen auf Gott sich die Welt unterwirft. „Christus muß in seiner eigentümlichen Berufstätigkeit ebenso getragen von Gott, wie als selbständig gegen alle Welt gedacht werden." Vor allen Dingen in seinem Sterben bewährt er seine sittliche Berufstreue. Für Ritschl ist „Christus der vollendete Offenbarer Gottes und das offenbare Urbild der geistigen Beherrschung der Welt." Ritschl will diese beiden Ausdrücke zugleich im „Prädikate seiner Gottheit" zusammenfassen. Aber wie eine Reihe von Restriktionen zeigen, will er **Christus nicht im realen metaphysischen Sinn Gottheit und Präexistenz beilegen, sondern nur den göttlichen Wert seiner sittlichen Offenbarerpersönlichkeit für die christliche Gemeinde ausdrücken.** „Wie die Person Christi geworden und dasjenige geworden ist, als welches sie sich für die ethische und religiöse Schätzung darbietet, ist kein Gegenstand theologischer Forschung, weil das Problem über jede Art von Forschung hinausliegt. Was die kirchliche Ueberlieferung in dieser Hinsicht darbietet, ist in sich undeutlich." Durch Christus können die Menschen die gläubige Ueberzeugung von der Liebe Gottes und von seiner Sündenvergebung oder seiner Rechtfertigung empfangen. Sie lassen ihr Mißtrauen gegen Gott nunmehr fallen oder versöhnen sich ihrerseits mit Gott. Wie schon die Umstellung der beiden Begriffe **Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung** im Titel des Werkes zeigt, ist für Ritschl **die Versöhnung nicht die Voraussetzung, sondern die Folge der Rechtfertigung.** Rechtfertigung ist die in der Offenbarung durch Christus jedem Gläubigen zugängliche Sündenvergebung. Versöhnung ist die darauffolgende Aussöhnung des Menschen mit Gott. „In dem Begriff der Versöhnung ist ausgedrückt, das diejenigen, welche bisher in aktivem Widerspruch mit Gott begriffen waren, durch die Verzeihung in die zustimmende Richtung auf Gott versetzt worden

sind." Der Zweck aber dieser göttlichen Vergebung und menschlichen Versöhnung ist die Entstehung einer Sittlichkeit, wie sie in Christus wirklich war, in seiner Gemeinde und durch diese auch in dem einzelnen Christen. Beide werden durch die Verbindung mit Gott Herren über die Natur und die von ihnen ausgehenden Hemmungen. „Die religiöse Herrschaft über die Welt, welche die direkte Bestimmung der Versöhnung mit Gott durch Christus bildet, wird durch den Glauben an die liebevolle Vorsehung Gottes, durch die Tugenden der Demut und der Geduld endlich durch das Dankgebet ausgeübt." „Für die christliche Gemeinde ist das Danken die dem Bitten übergeordnete Anerkennung Gottes." Der einzelne Christ vollzieht dieses sittlich-religiöse Leben in einem bestimmten weltlichen Beruf, die christliche Gemeinschaft, indem sie sich eng mit dem Staat verbindet, ihm politische Entschlossenheit für die Durchführung geistiger Güter gibt.

Besonders deutlich kommen die neuprotestantischen Grundtendenzen Ritschls in seiner Auffassung der **Reformation** zum Ausdruck wie er sie in der „Geschichte des Pietismus" (1880) und in seiner Festrede über „Luther" (1883) zum Ausdruck gebracht hat. Danach beharrte das reformatorische Dogma wesentlich noch auf der katholischen Stufe, sodaß „die reformatorischen Ideen in den theologischen Büchern Luthers und Melanchtons mehr verdeckt als offenbar sind." **Nur in ihrem sittlichen Lebensideal stellt die Reformation etwas neues dar.** „Wenn die Reformation des 16. Jahrhunderts kein Ideal des christlichen Lebens aufzeigte, dann würde man in großer Verlegenheit sein, ihr eine epochemachende Bedeutung zuzugestehen. In dem Lebensideal unsrer Reformatoren stehen der Glaube an Gottes Vorsehung nebst dem Gebet und die Schätzung der weltlichen Berufe als des Ortes für die Uebung der Liebe gegen die Menschen in gegenseitiger Wechselbeziehung." Bei dieser Auffassung der Reformation ist es verständlich, daß Ritschl eine sehr gründliche Reform des Altprotestantismus verlangt und sie durch seine Lehre vollziehen will. In der Tat hat **Ritschl trotz Beibehaltung ja Verstärkung des altprotestantischen Biblizismus eine starke Umgestaltung des Christentums in der Richtung auf einen ethischen Neuprotestantismus durchgeführt.** Er hat den Glauben an die Versöhnung des heiligen Gottes durch das Werk Christi, sonderlich seines Todes, ersetzt durch das Vertrauen auf die stets vorhandene, nur in Christus besonders eindrücklich offenbarte göttliche Vaterliebe. An die Stelle des spezifisch christlichen Versöhnungsglaubens tritt ein allgemeiner Vorsehungsglaube. Der Hauptzweck des Christentums erscheint aber in der Ermöglichung einer Sittlichkeit im Kantischen Sinn. Diese läßt den Einzelnen seine Herrschaft über die Natur in einem innerweltlich-sittlichen Beruf erweisen und die Kirche

vor allem die sittlichen Zwecke des Staates unterstützen. — Diese neuprotestantischen Tendenzen Ritschls treten bei einigen seiner Schüler noch deutlicher hervor.

IV.

Von allen Schülern Ritschls hat **W. Herrmann** (1846—1922) im engsten Anschluß an den Kantianismus **die antimetaphysischen, antimystischen und ethizistischen Gedankengänge Ritschls am kräftigsten ausgebildet.** Er hat besonders als sittliche Persönlichkeit und Lehrer viele Jahrzehnte in Marburg eine sehr einflußreiche Wirksamkeit ausgeübt. In seiner Erstlingsschrift: „Die Metaphysik in der Theologie" (1876) erklärt er: „Für die Erschwerung oder Erleichterung der religiösen Aufgabe macht es gar nichts aus, ob die dogmatische Metaphysik, welcher der Christ folgt, materialistisch oder idealistisch gerichtet ist." Denn — so führt seine zweite Schrift: „Die Religion im Verhältnis zum Welterkennen und zur Sittlichkeit" (1879) aus — „Ich habe mich an Kant angeschlossen, in dessen Trennung der theoretischen Erkenntnis von der sittlich bedingten Ueberzeugung ich den Freibrief für die aus den Fesseln philosophischer Weltanschauung erlöste Theologie erblicke." Herrmann geht wie Kant von einer völlig **autonom** — auch von der Religion unabhängigen — **Sittlichkeit** aus. In seiner „Ethik" (5. Auflage 1913) stellt er fest: „Jeder Mensch kann die Frage nach dem Inhalt des sittlichen Gebotes aus sich selbst erledigen." Dieses stellt zwei Forderungen: „Wir sollen unbedingt wahrhaftige geistige Gemeinschaft mit andern wollen und wir sollen dadurch selbst innerlich selbständig sein." Der Befolgung dieser Gebote stellt sich jedoch das Schwergewicht unsrer Natürlichkeit oder die Sünde entgegen. Die Kraft zum Guten gibt darum erst die Religion und zwar das Christentum, ganz speziell das „Innere Leben Jesu." **Während Herrmann in der autonomen Begründung und in der Inhaltsbestimmung der Ethik Kant einfach folgt, lehnt er dessen sittliche Autarkie zu Gunsten der geschichtlichen Offenbarung in der Person Jesu ab.** Sieht man allerdings genauer zu, so findet man, daß das Bild Jesu bei Herrmann dem allgemeinen sittlichen Ideal sehr stark angenähert ist. Darüber hat er sich in seinem verbreitesten Buch: „Der Verkehr des Christen mit Gott" (1886) näher ausgesprochen. Herrmann will bei der Erfassung des Bildes Jesu zwar von der evangelischen Ueberlieferung ausgehen, dann aber im Hinblick auf die historisch-kritischen Unsicherheiten von ihr unabhängig werden. Darum soll sittlich-religiöse Bedeutung nur das „innere Leben Jesu" haben. Dieses „innere Leben" hat aber wesentlich zum Inhalt das allgemeine ethische Ideal der geistigen Persönlichkeit und der Gemeinschaftsstiftung. Indem wir unser eigenes unvollkommenes sittliches Leben mit dem vollendeten sitt-

lichen Leben Jesu verbinden, empfangen wir die Kraft, das Gute zu tuen. Im Anblick Jesu gewinnen wir zugleich Gottesgewißheit in dem Sinn, daß das Gute oder Gott die Macht über die Wirklichkeit ist. Indem dieser Gott durch Jesus mit uns in Verkehr tritt, offenbart er sich uns als Vaterliebe, welche uns die Sünde vergibt. „In dem grenzenlosen Vertrauen zu Jesu Güte wird sein Glaube an Gott unser Glaube. Wir merken, daß uns dabei nicht etwas Fremdes aufgedrängt wird, sondern daß eine Ueberzeugung, die in uns selbst hervordrang, von den Schranken unsrer Schwachheit befreit wird." Das einzige, was uns aus den Evangelien als eine uns überwältigende und jeden Zweifel ausschließende Wirklichkeit entgegentreten kann, ist gerade das Zarteste, das innere Leben Jesu selbst. Nur sofern wir selbst nach einem rechtschaffenen Inhalt unsers Lebens verlangen, können wir die Kraft und Fülle dieser Seele wahrnehmen." So erscheint bei Hermann das „innere Leben Jesu" im Grunde nur als eine plastisch-persönliche, von der Schwachheit befreite Gestaltung des allgemein sittlichen Ideales. Schon vorhandener sittlicher Besitz im Menschen wird durch das Christentum von seinen Hemmungen befreit und mit der religiösen Gewißheit der sündenvergebenden Vaterliebe Gottes verbunden. Die ethizistische Richtung bei Herrmann löst wie bei Kant weitgehend nicht nur die metaphysischen, sondern auch die geschichtlichen Elemente des Christentums auf. „Wenn wir uns von Luther führen lassen wollen, so müssen wir das Christentum Luthers von der Theologie Luthers unterscheiden, die von katholischen Voraussetzungen aus entworfen ist."

Konsequenterweise lehnt Herrmann auch jeden Versuch eine normative christliche Glaubenslehre zu schaffen ab und unterscheidet stark zwischen einem Christentum Luthers und einer Thelogie Luthers. Bei Herrmann liegt ein scharf ausgeprägter ethischer Neuprotestantismus vor, der unter dem Einfluß Kants grundlegende geschichtliche und metaphysische Bestandteile des Altprotestantismus beseitigt hat.

Während Herrmann den neukantischen Ethizismus Ritschls bis zur setzten Konsequenz durchgeführt hat, ist **Harnack** (geb. 1851) der Vollender seines **Historismus.** Als Historiker hat Adolf Harnack eine Ueberfülle bedeutsamster historischer Einzelarbeiten veröffentlicht, besonders in Bezug auf das Neue Testament — hier immer konservativer werdend — und in Bezug auf die alte Kirchengeschichte — hier im „Marcion" das Ideal seiner Theologie schauend. Er hat aber auch die prinzipielle Frage nach dem **Wesen des Christentums** mit historischen Mitteln zu beantworten gesucht. In seinem außerordentlich weitverbreiteten Buch „Das Wesen des Christentums" (1. Auflage 1900) erklärt er: „Was ist Christen-

tum? — Lediglich im historischen Sinn wollen wir diese Frage hier zu beantworten suchen, das heißt mit den Mitteln der geschichtlichen Wissenschaft und mit der Lebenserfahrung, die aus erlebter Geschichte erworben ist." Allein in der hinzugefügten Erfahrung verbirgt sich eine dogmatische Stellungnahme, die Harnacks geschichtliche Feststellungen maßgebend bestimmt. Sie trägt rational-religiösen und -ethischen Charakter. Der Rationalismus spricht sich ähnlich wie bei Strauß in dem Satz aus: „Gewiß es geschehen keine Wunder, aber des Wunderbaren und Unerklärlichen gibt es genug." Positiv reduziert Harnack den Inhalt des Evangeliums auf die Formel: „In dem Gefüge Gott der Vater, die Vorsehung, die Kindschaft, der unendliche Wert der Menschenseele spricht sich das ganze Evangelium aus." Diese Erkenntnisse decken sich wesentlich mit der Dogmatik Ritschls. In negativer Hinsicht lehnt Harnack die Gottessohnschaft Jesu im metaphysischem Sinn ab und stellt fest, daß man „den Osterglauben auch ohne die Osterbotschaft haben kann." In der ersten Auflage erklärte er sogar: „Nicht der Sohn, sondern allein der Vater gehört in das Evangelium wie es Jesus verkündet hat hinein."

In seiner großen **„Dogmengeschichte"** (1885) folgt Harnack den antimetaphysischen Tendenzen Kants und Ritschls. Er definiert: „Die kirchlichen Dogmen sind die begrifflich formulierten und für eine wissenschaftlich apologetische Behandlung ausgeprägten christlichen Glaubenslehren, welche die Erkenntnis Gottes, der Welt und der durch Christus geschehenen Erlösung umfassen und den objektiven Inhalt der Religion darstellen." In solchen Dogmen sieht Harnack eine Gefahr, daß das Wissen den Glauben verdränge. Als seine Meinung erscheint zunächst die Behauptung, das Dogma widerspreche in jeder Form prinzipiell dem Christentum und stelle eine überwundene oder zu überwindende Größe dar. Anderseits erkennt doch Harnack an, daß das Evangelium auch schon bei Jesus einen festen Inhalt hat, der sich nichts anders als begrifflich, das heißt aber in Dogmen formulieren läßt. Infolgedessen beschränkt sich seine ablehnende Kritik auf das **altkirchliche Dogma**, denn bei diesem soll der griechische Geist der entscheidende Faktor gewesen sein, sodaß Harnacks berühmte Definition lautet: **„Das Dogma ist in seiner Konzeption und in seinem Aufbau ein Werk des griechischen Geistes auf dem Boden des Evangeliums."** Von diesem Dogma muß er aber weiter feststellen, daß es die Reformation nicht nur stehen ließ, sondern es auch durch seine Verbindung mit dem persönlichen Glauben restaurierte und kräftigte. „Es hat keinen Theologen nach Athanasius gegeben, der die Lehre von der Gottheit Christi für den Glauben so lebendig gemacht hat, wie

Luther." Dafür schreibt Harnack der altprotestantischen Reformation einen doppelten Charakter zu: „Die Reformation, wie sie sich im Christentum Luthers darstellt, ist in vieler Hinsicht eine altkatholische, respektive auch eine mittelalterliche Erscheinung; dagegen auf ihren religiösen Kern beurteilt ist sie es nicht; vielmehr Wiederherstellung des Paulinischen Christentums im Geist einer neuen Zeit."

Eine großzügige Verbindung der Ritschlschen Theologie mit dem philosophischen Gedankenkreis Kants hat **Julius Kaftan** in Berlin (1849—1926) in einer seiner ersten und einer seiner letzten Schriften unternommen. In **„Die Wahrheit der christlichen Religion"** (1888) versucht er zu beweisen, „das nur die christliche Idee vom Reich Gottes als dem höchsten Gut der Menschheit den Anforderungen entspricht, welche an die wahre, vernünftige, allgemein gültige Idee vom höchsten Gut gestellt werden könne: „Wie bei Kant ist jedoch dieses Gottesreich nur ein Postulat der Vernunft." „Ueber seine offenbarungsmäßige geschichtliche Wirklichkeit entscheidet erst die Gewißheit des Glaubens," — für die jener Beweis überflüssig ist. In der Schrift **„Philosophie des Protestantismus"** (1917) sieht Kaftan mit Ritschl die für den Protestantismus bedeutsame Leistung Kants in der Begrenzung des theoretischen Erkennens und in dem Primat der praktischen Vernunft. — In seiner weitverbreiteten **„Dogmatik"** (7. und 8. Auflage 1920) vertritt Kaftan im Prinzip den biblizistischen Offenbarungspositivismus Ritschls, nähert sich aber in der Tat auch bei manchen Dogmen wie zum Beispiel der Absolutheit Gottes und der Gottheit Christi — „Die Christologie ist nichts anders als die Lehre von der Gottheit Christi" — so stark der kirchlichen Anschauung, daß man hier nicht mehr von einem Neuprotestantismus reden kann. Das gilt auch von andern Vertretern der „Ritschlschen Rechten" wie etwa von **Th. Häring** in Tübingen, der sich besonders in der Versöhnungslehre von Ritschl entfernt und biblischen Gedankengängen angeschlossen hat, wie von **Kattenbusch** in Halle.

V.

In der dritten Generation entfernen sich die mit der Ritschlschen Theologie zusammenhängenden Theologen immer entscheidender von den Grundthesen Ritschls, indem sie zugleich Anregungen von der altprotestantischen wie der religionsgeschichtlichen Theologie aufnehmen. Das gilt von **Wobbermin** (geb. 1869 in Göttingen), einem Schüler Kaftans in seinem großen Werk: „Systematische Theologie nach religionspsychologischer Methode" (1913). Er nimmt, wie der Titel seines Werkes zeigt, die von Ritschl abgelehnte Religionspsychologie zum Ausgangspunkt und verbindet sie in eigentümlicher Weise mit der Religionsgeschichte. Das Haupt-

interesse der Religion liegt in ihrer Wahrheit, welcher der Entwurf einer dogmatischen Metaphysik entspricht. In der Definition von Religion und Christentum folgt Wobbermin der Ritschlschen Rechten.

Gleichfalls aus religionspsychologischen und religionsgeschichtlichen Untersuchungen ist die sehr verbreitete Monographie von Professor **Otto** (geb. 1863) in Marburg **„Das Heilige"** (1. Auflage 1917) erwachsen. Dieser von Ritschl ganz zurückgestellte Begriff erscheint hier als der eigentliche Kern aller Religion und gerade auch der biblisch-lutherischen Frömmigkeit. Das Heilige ist einmal das Numinose, das Mysteriöse, das „Ganz Andere," welches das Gemüt des Menschen mit starrem Erstaunen erfüllt. Anderseits besitzt aber das Heilige etwas Faszinierendes und Anziehendes, welches dem Menschen Vertrauen abgewinnt. Das Heilige setzt sich aus irrationalen und rationalen Elementen zusammen. Dementsprechend enthält auch die Glaubenslehre sowohl rationale als auch irrationale Sätze. Mit dieser Auffassung des Heiligen hat sich Otto stark einer religiösen Grundposiition des Altprotestantismus genähert.

Die jungfräuliche Geburt Jesu.

Von Dr. C. Schieler.

„Ich glaube an Jesum Christum, Seinen eingeborenen Sohn, unsern Herrn, der empfangen ist vom Heiligen Geist, geboren aus Maria der Jungfrau" — so bekennen wir betend unsern christlichen Glauben allsonntäglich mit der Gemeinde, so bekennen wir gemeinsam mit den Eltern und Paten bei der Taufe der Kinder, so bekennen die Konfirmanden ihren Glauben in ernster, heiliger, entscheidender Stunde; auf dieses Bekenntnis wurden wir verpflichtet bei unsrer Ordination als Prediger der Evangelischen Kirche. Hiedurch bekennen wir uns und leiten andre Christen an, sich zu bekennen zu dem Glauben, daß Jesus Christus, unser Herr, ist geboren von einer Jungfrau, der Jungfrau Maria. Handeln wir damit recht? Ist dieser Glaube auch angesichts der neuern und neuesten Bibelkritik berechtigt? Es ist ein heftiger Streit hierüber entbrannt, der mit einer gewissen unverkennbaren Erbitterung nun schon lange Zeit geführt wird, nicht allein in Schriften der Gelehrten, in Reden vor Theologen- und Laienkreisen, sondern sogar auf gewissen Kanzeln; der Streit ist aus den theologischen Lehrsälen bis in die bescheidensten Studierstuben des Landpastors getragen worden; namhafte Laien, berühmte Scientisten haben sich eingehend damit beschäftigt.

So erscheint der Wunsch ganz berechtigt, diese Frage auch in unserm Kreise „sine ira et studio" möglichst sachgemäß zu behandeln.

Zuerst wollen wir die Geschichte dieses Glaubens in Kürze betrachten. Derselbe ist so alt als das Christentum; er wurde von der christlichen Kirche gelehrt zu jeder Zeit und in jedem Land. Das ist eine sehr wichtige Tatsache. Er hat unzählige heftige Kontroversen in der Lehre der Kirche und all die großen Spaltungen in der Kirche überdauert. Er wird gelehrt in der römisch- und in der griechisch-katholischen Kirche; wird gelehrt in den Kirchen des Protestantismus. So sehr auch die römische Kirche und der Protestantismus, was Lehre betrifft, von einander abweichen: beide große, über die ganze Erde verbreiteten kirchlichen Gemeinschaften glauben und lehren die jungfräuliche Geburt Jesu. Und als die protestantische Kirche sich spaltete in Lutheraner und Reformierte und in die anglokanische Kirche Englands: alle hielten fest an der Jungfrau-Geburt Jesu; und auch die von der englischen Hochkirche getrennten Nonkonformisten: die Baptisten, die Kongregationalisten und die Presbyterianer, alle bekennen diesen Glauben. Und ziehen wir Amerika in unsre geschichtliche Betrachtung ein, so finden wir dieselbe erstaunliche Tatsache, daß die vielen christlichen Gemeinschaften, welche hier auf dem Boden des Protestantismus im Laufe der

Zeit sich bildeten, alle mit wenigen Ausnahmen, den Glauben an die jungfräuliche Geburt Jesu bekennen und lehren.

Dieser Glaube ist deutlichst ausgedrückt in allen großen Glaubensbekenntnissen, im apostolischen, nizänischen, in dem der Synode von Konstantinopel und Chalcedon; das sind die alten Bekenntnisse. Aber auch die der neueren Zeit: die Augsburger Konfession, die Westminster Konfession und die 39 Artikel der anglikanischen Kirche drücken die jungfräuliche Geburt Jesu deutlichst aus. Dazu kann ich noch das in Musik gesetzte Glaubensbekenntnis der Kirche fügen, das herrliche „Te Deum," welches Ambrosius und Augustinus zugeschrieben wird. Zuletzt kommt noch als die alles andre überragende Tatsache hinzu: die jungfräuliche Geburt ist in der Heiligen Schrift sowohl des Alten als auch des Neuen Testaments gelehrt, ist also ein Bestandteil des Wortes Gottes — eine von Gott geoffenbarte Wahrheit. Wer demnach die Heilige Schrift und zwar die ganze Heilige Schrift, wie sie uns von der Kirche Christi geboten ist, als vom Heiligen Geist inspiriert und darum als Gottes Wort anerkennt, muß auch konsequenter Weise an die jungfräuliche Geburt Jesu glauben und daran festhalten.

Daß im zweiten Jahrhundert die Ebioniten und Gnostiker diese Lehre als eine schöne Erfindung zurückwiesen, daß die Deisten des 17. Jahrhunderts sie als Ausgeburt phantastischer Schwärmerei und als unmöglich verwarfen, und daß auch die Rationalisten des 19. Jahrhunderts sie als Legende, als Mythe betrachteten, wird die nicht sehr verwundern, welche diese Geistesrichtungen näher kennen. Aber in unsern Tagen wird der Glaube an die jungfräuliche Geburt Jesu nicht bloß von Ungläubigen und Skeptikern, nicht bloß von solchen, die außerhalb der Kirche Christi stehen, sondern auch von solchen angezweifelt und geleugnet, verworfen und bekämpft, welche gläubige Christen sein wollen, von Geistlichen und Laien, von Professoren der Theologie und gelehrten Laien, von solchen, die eines großen Rufes auf dem Gebiet der Wissenschaft sich erworben haben. Ein altes Dogma der christlichen Kirche, das von allen Zweigen der Kirche Christi festgehalten wurde und noch festgehalten wird, das wird nun mit selter Energie bekämpft und verworfen von solchen, die gläubige Christen zu sein behaupten. Daß dadurch Verwirrung der Gemüter, eine beklagenswerte Konfussion entsteht, ist leicht begreiflich.

Um diese Situation recht zu verstehen, ist es notwendig, den Ausgangspunkt und den Verlauf des mit großer Erbitterung und mit Aufbietung aller zu gebote stehenden wissenschaftlichen Mitteln geführten Kampfes, näher zu betrachten. In Deutschland wurde der Streit angeregt durch die Weigerung des Pfarrers Lizentiat Christoph Schrempf in Württemberg, das Apostolische Glaubens-

bekenntnis bei Taufen zu gebrauchen; und der Grund dieser Weigerung oder, ich will lieber sagen, einer der Gründe dieser Weigerung und zwar der schwerwiegendste, waren die Worte des Symbolums: „Empfangen vom Heiligen Geist, geboren von der Jungfrau Maria.“ Da Schrempfs Gemeinde von seinem Subjektivismus nichts wissen wollte und das Konsistorium bat, ihr einen andern Geistlichen zu schicken, suspendierte diese Kirchenbehörde Schrempf und setzte ihn, da er fortgesetzt auf seiner Lehrwillkür beharrte, „wegen Verfehlung wider die übernommene Dienstpflicht“ im Jahre 1892 ab. Schrempfs Entlassung regte weite Kreise Deutschlands auf, da in Schrempf die sogenannte moderne Theologie sich selbst verurteilt fühlte. Professor Harnack, der jetzt als Haupt der modernen Bibelkritiker gilt, mischte sich in diesen Streit ein, der immer weitere Kreise ergriff und bei vielen Theologen eine Verstimmtheit gegen die moderne Thologie auslöste. Der Evangelische Oberkirchenrat erklärte, „daß er bei aller evangelischen Weitherzigkeit und entfernt davon, aus dem Bekenntnis oder aus jedem Einzelstück desselben ein starres Lehrgesetz zu machen, doch etwaige agitatorische Versuche, das Apostolikum aus seiner Stellung zu verdrängen, bei seinen Geistlichen nicht dulden werde.“ (25. November 1892.) Was speziell unsre Frage betrifft, so anerkennt Harnack wohl, daß die Jungfraugeburt Jesu ein integraler Bestandteil des Matthäus- und Lukas-Evangeliums sei, meint aber etwas naiv, „daß irgend ein Weg sich finden lasse, auf welchem die betreffenden Stellen in Matthäus und Lukas rechtmäßig gestrichen werden könnten als nicht zu dem Originaltext dieser Evangelien gehörend,“ wie er ja die Ansicht offen aussprach, daß „ein gereifter Christ an mannigfachen Sätzen der Evangelien Anstoß nehmen könne.“ Das ist so ganz trefflich Harnacks Ausdrucksweise bezeichnend.

Ich habe diesen Streit in Deutschland miterlebt und habe daran teilgenommen und muß erklären, daß die Art und Weise, wie die sogenannte moderne liberale Bibelkritik mit den Evangelien verfuhr, doch recht viele Theologen, die liberal gerichtet waren (ich gehörte diesen an), verletzen und abstoßen mußte. Professor D. H. J. Holtzmann in Straßburg, ein gefeierter Bibelkritiker, schreibt in seinem Hand-Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, Seite 32. „Innerhalb der synoptischen Vorgeschichte selbst weisen die Genealogie, ferner einzelne stehen gebliebene Ausdrücke wie Eltern, Vater, Mutter und das ausdrücklich bezeugte: οὐ συνῆκαν τὸ ῥῆμα (und sie verstanden das Wort nicht, 2, 50) auf Abstammung aus der Ehe Josephs mit Maria.“ Ferner erklärt er und sucht es mit einem großen Ballast von gelehrten Darlegungen nachzuweisen, daß die Vorstellung von der Jungfraugeburt auf judenchristlichem Gebiet entstanden sei; als Frucht des theologischen Nachdenkens über Jes.

7, 14 (vergleiche Harnack, Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, 87, 91) hätte sich aber nicht durchgeschlagen ohne die mächtig entgegenkommende, über die mannigfachsten Präformationen dazu verfügende, Disposition der griechisch-römischen Welt. Diese habe in ihren Mythen „Götterkinder" gehabt, wie zum Beispiel Danae, Melanippe, Auge und Antiope; ja sie habe sogar in geschichtlichen Persönlichkeiten, wie Pythagoras, Plato, Dionysius, Alexander, Seleukus, Augustus Abkömmlinge von Göttern gesehen. Sobald das Christentum daher auf griechischem Boden sich angesiedelt hatte, meint Holtzmann, wirkten solcherlei Vorstellungen kräftiger, wobei ihnen selbstverständlich die gröbere, die allzusinnliche Form abgestreift wurde. Eine noch genauere Analogie würde freilich der asiatische Osten mit der Jungfraugeburt des Buddha bieten. Der mehr volkstümlichen Einkleidung der Sache sei überdies die mehr theologisch bedingte Reflexion auf Präexistenz unmittelbar zur Seite getreten.

Die Darstellungen der Jungfraugeburt Jesu in den Evangelien des Matthäus und Lukas sind daher diesem Vertreter der sogenannten höheren Bibelkritik „liebliche Sagengewinde," womit die überströmende Verehrung und Liebe der ältesten Christenheit die Wiege ihres Herrn umkränzt hat, von welchen die eine demjenigen, welcher den andern Kranz geschlungen hat, bereits vorgelegen zu haben scheine (er weist zum Beweise hiefür auf Lukas 1, 30. 35 und 77 hin). Und drehe man das Prioritätsverhältnis um, so wachse nur die Möglichkeit, die ganze Vorgeschichte auf die schriftstellerische Kunst eines dichterisch angelegten Evangelisten zurückzuführen, wogegen als andre Möglichkeit die Benutzung einer judenchristlichen Quelle in Betracht komme. „Je mehr Bewunderung übrigens die dichterische Schönheit dieser Erzeugnisse altchristlicher Andacht verdienen und auch gefunden haben, desto weniger wird man ihrem Geist da gerecht, wo man sich abmüht, sie auf Kosten des Wunderdufts, den die Morgennebel der evangelischen Geschichte darauf getaut haben, in eine Prosa umzusetzen, welche immer gleich unwahrscheinlich klingen wird, mag man sie nun selbst wieder als Bericht über einen wunderbaren Tatbestand (wie die herkömmliche Apologetik tue) oder gar als konfuse Darstellung trivialer Alltäglichkeiten auffassen (wie der frühere Rationalismus getan)." Holtzmann a. a. O. S. 53.

Darnach ist also die Jungfraugeburt Jesu nichts anders als eine liebliche Sage, erdacht von einem dichterisch beanlagten Evangelisten nach dem Muster heidnischer Götterfabeln! Wer ist nun der dichterisch beanlagte Evangelist? Matthäus oder Lukas? Soweit ich diese beiden Evangelisten kenne: keiner von beiden! Sie zeigen beide keine Spur von dichterischer Beanlagung. Sie sind vom Heiligen Geist inspirierte Darsteller geschichtlicher Tatsachen.

Was Lukas betrifft, so stimme ich voll und ganz den Ausführungen eines hochgeachteten amerikanischen Gelehrten bei, die ich in seinem sehr wertvollen Buch finde: „A Scientific Man and the Bible." Darin beschäftigt er sich mit den Resultaten der modernen Bibelkritik, respektive mit den Eindrücken, die sie auf ihn gemacht hatten. Er schreibt Seite 28:

A destructive analysis of the Holy Scriptures called the Higher Criticism of the Bible imported from intellectual Germany, was sweeping England and our own America, seemed only too eager to fall into line. The effect of the criticism to knock out the one great prop of faith by subdividing the Bible into innumerable fragments or perhaps more literally by tearing it to pieces, while questioning its authenticity and challenging its authority on every page with the rejection of many vital parts as the myths of a nomadic people. Miracles were discredited because contrary to the laws of nature, and with them logically went the Virgin Birth of Christ, his Deity, his atoning Death, his resurrection and his present mediatorial office at the right hand of the Majesty on High.

Dieses Verfahren einer Gruppe von außerordentlich fähigen, oftmals persönlich reizender Männer und gewöhnlich in den Sprachen sehr erfahrener Lehrer erzeugte ein solches Gefühl der Unsicherheit, daß in vielen das Gefühl entstand, es gäbe keine Gewißheit mehr, daß, wenn immer und wo immer man die Bibel aufschlüge, um Geistesnahrung zu finden, man statt dessen nur Spreu finde. Eine weitere Folge war in den Kolleges wahrzunehmen, indem unsre jungen Männer (auch Theologen!) fürchteten, „unwissenschaftlich" oder „engherzig" genannt zu werden, wenn sie sich nicht zu den Resultaten der höheren Bibelkritik bekennen würden.

Dieser Mann bekennt sodann weiterhin, daß der „destructive criticism" nicht so leicht beiseite geschoben werden oder übergangen werden konnte, so daß die ernste Frage entstand: wie weit würde er gehen in der Verwerfung der Vergangenheit als wertlos und welche Methode würde die beste sein, einige ihrer in die Augen fallenden Irrtümer zu behandeln. Und dieser Mann, ein gebildeter Laie, unterzog sich der schweren Aufgabe, die Bibel, und zwar die ganze Bibel, in all ihren Teilen als Gotteswort zu verteidigen und ich glaube, er hat diese Aufgabe glänzend gelöst in zwei Aufsätzen: „How I came to my present faith" und „Why I believe the whole Bible ist true." Eingehend beschäftigt er sich in einem andern Essay mit der Frage der Jungfraugeburt Jesu und widerlegt alle gegen diese Argumente in überzeugendster, wissenschaftlicher Weise.

Dieser Gelehrte, Professor Howard Kelly, M. D., L. L. D., hat nach einer glänzenden Laufbahn als Professor der Gynäkologie an der Johns Hopkins-Universität und Arzt von weltweiter Reputation sich nun ins Privatleben zurückgezogen, um ungestört speziellen Forschungen sich zu widmen. Er ist im Besitz von akademischen Würden seitens mehrerer Universitäten und wurde von wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaften in der ganzen zivilisierten Welt geehrt, ist Mitglied wissenschaftlicher Vereinigungen in Schottland, Irland, Italien, Deutschland, Frankreich, Rumänien und Rußland, und ist Verfasser von vielen wissenschaftlichen Artikeln in Fachzeitschriften und einiger Werke von anerkanntem Wert. Somit dürfen wir ihn begrüßen als einen würdigen, mutvollen Zeugen der Wahrheit von hoher Bedeutung.

Welche Bedeutung kann gegenüber den klaren Auslegungen eines solchen Bibelkenners, obschon er Laie ist, die Art und Weise haben, wie zum Beispiel der Theologieprofessor Reinhold Seeberg die Menschwerdung Christi und damit die Jungfraugeburt Jesu in seiner nun vollständig im Druck erschienen Dogmatik zu behandeln für gut findet. „Er hält dafür," wie Dr. Kamphausen in einer Kritik dieses Werkes anführt, „daß die Geburtsgeschichten (Matth. 1 und Lukas 1) nicht unbedingt diese Bedeutung haben, daß ihnen überhaupt keine für den Glauben wesentliche Bedeutung zukommt. Es könnte auch Joseph der leibliche Vater Jesu sein. Die wesentliche Sache sei die Verbindung des göttlichen Geistes mit dem Menschen Jesu; diese habe ihn vor jeglicher Sünde bewahrt." Demnach müßte man den Glaubenssatz: Ich glaube an Jesum Christum unsern Herrn, der empfangen ist vom Heiligen Geist, geboren von der Jungfrau Maria, konsequenter Weise einfach ausstreichen. Und somit tritt der genannte Professor einfach in die sehr ausgetretenen Pfade früherer Zeit. Von der wesensgleichen Gottheit Jesu Christi kann da keine Rede mehr sein. Jungfraugeburt und die Gottheit Christi sind unzertrennlich miteinander verbunden.

Professor Kelly schreibt, daß die für die Jungfraugeburt gebrauchten Stellen des Alten Testaments: Genesis 3, 15, Jesaias 7, 14 und Jeremias 31, 22 — weder deutlich, noch notwendig sich beziehen auf Christus als geboren von einem Weib oder einer Jungfrau mit Ausschluß eines irdischen Vaters; „aber im Augenblick, wo die Tatsache durch den Heiligen Geist geoffenbart ist, wird es sofort klar, daß die in diesen Stellen gebrauchte Ausdrucksweise eine solche Interpretation zuläßt und dadurch ihre volle Bedeutung gewinnt." Er meint damit die Stellen bei Matthäus 1, 18—23 und Lukas 1, 26—35. Genau aus dem griechischen Text übersetzt, lautet die Darstellung des Matthäus wie folgt: Des Christus Geburt war aber also: Als seine Mutter Maria dem Joseph verlobt war, wurde sie, bevor dieselbe noch zusammenkamen, erfunden

als schwanger seiend vom Heiligen Geist. Joseph aber, ihr Mann, indem er gerecht und nicht willens war, sie zu beschimpfen, entschloß sich heimlich, sie zu entlassen. Während er aber dem nachdachte, siehe da erschien ein Engel des Herrn ihm im Traum und sprach: Joseph, Sohn Davids, nicht mögest du dich scheuen, Maria, dein Weib, aufzunehmen; denn das in ihr Erzeugte ist (entstammt) aus heiligem Geist. Sie aber wird einen Sohn gebären, und du wirst seinen Sohn Jesus nennen, denn er wird sein Volk von ihren Sünden erretten. Das alles aber ist geschehen, auf das erfüllt sei das vom Herrn durch den Propheten Geredete, der sagt: „Siehe die Jungfrau wird schwanger sein und einen Sohn gebären, und sie werden nennen seinen Namen Emmanuel," was verdolmetscht ist: Mit uns (ist) Gott. Erwacht aber vom Schlaf, tat Joseph, wie ihm der Engel des Herrn aufgetragen hatte, und nahm sein Weib auf. Und er erkannte sie nicht, bis daß sie einen Sohn gebar, und er nannte seinen Namen Jesus.

Hierzu sei noch erläuternd bemerkt: Der Ausdruck „verlobt" war, *μνηστευθείσης*, deutet im Zusammenhang nur die feierliche, bei den Juden gebräuchliche Verlobung an, durch welche des Joseph Bedenken verständlich werde. Ferner bedeutet: „Bevor dieselben zusammenkamen" einfach zusammenwohnten, *συνελθεῖν* hier im Unterschied von *οὐκ ἐγίγνωσκεν* in Vers 25. — Durch den Zusatz: Joseph war gerecht, wird er als gesetzesstrenger Jude bezeichnet und sein weiteres Verhalten als für ihn geboten bemerkbar gemacht. — „Das alles aber ist geschehen," bezieht sich ebenso auf die Eröffnung des Engels über die Herkunft des Kindes der Maria, wie über dessen Bestimmung.

Ueberblicken wir nun noch einmal die ganze Darstellung des Matthäus von der Jungfraugeburt Jesu, so ergibt sich folgender Zusammenhang: Dem Nachweis der Abstammung Jesu aus dem Geschlecht der Verheißung läßt Matthäus sofort den Bericht über die Weise folgen, in welcher Gott selber die Wunderbarkeit seines menschlichen Werdens behufs Klarstellung seiner Messiaswürde vor Joseph verbürgte, dem es als Verlobten der Maria nahe lag, an Jesu Geburt Anstoß zu nehmen. Zu dem Ende zeichnet Matthäus zunächst (Vers 18 und 19) die Situation, indem er angibt, wie einerseits vor dem Beginn des ehelichen Zusammenlebens mit Joseph Marias Schwangerschaft bemerkbar wurde (Vers 18) und anderseits deshalb Joseph aus Zweifel an der Lauterkeit seiner Verlobten vorhatte, diese, wenn auch nicht gerade als Sünderin öffentlich bloßzustellen (5. Mose 22. 23), so doch mittels eines nach jeder feierlichen Verlobung gebotenen Scheines (5. Mose 24, 1) zu entlassen (Vers 19). Erst dann (Vers 20—22) beschreibt er umständlich, wie der bedenkliche Joseph mittels eines ihm von Gott gesandten Traumgesichtes über den heiligen Ursprung des Zustandes der

Maria und den messianischen Beruf ihres zu erwartenden Sohnes, ein Erretter seines Volkes von dessen Sündenschuld zu werden, unterrichtet, und zugleich angewiesen wurde, ihm den entsprechenden Jesusnamen beizulegen. Weil dem Matthäus allein der damit bekundete Ursprung des Kindes von entscheidender Bedeutung ist, berichtet er, ohne der Geburt selber weiter zu gedenken, auch nur von der Befolgung jener göttlichen Weisung durch Joseph, den in den Augen Israels legitimen Vater Jesu. Hingegen schaltet er nach der Mitteilung der Ankündigung des übernatürlichen Ursprungs des Kindes der Maria einen Hinweis darauf ein, daß in der damit gesetzten Geburt aus einer Jungfrau die genaue Erfüllung jener Verheißung liege, die dem davidischen Geschlecht über die Person dessen, der es zu neuem Glanz erheben sollte, bereits durch Jesaja (7, 14) gegeben worden war. (Vergleiche Nösgen, Kommentar). Damit hat aber Matthäus zugleich bewiesen, daß Gottes in der ganzen Geschlechtsabfolge vorbereiteter und zuvor verkündigter Heilsratschluß bezüglich des Eintritts des Sünderheilands in die Welt durch göttliches Eingreifen mitten in der Zeit des Herabsinkens des davidischen Geschlechtes zu immer größerer Geringheit zur Verwirklichung gelangt ist.

Indem nun das Evangelium Matthäi die Erfüllung der Weissagung Jesaja 7, 14 in der dem Joseph zuteilgewordenen Offenbarung über den übernatürlichen Ursprung des Kleides der Maria einflicht, sollte an der Messianität jener Stelle bei Jesaja eigentlich kein Zweifel bestehen. Professor Kelly erblickt deshalb hierin einen Beleg für die Jungfraugeburt Jesu in dem Alten Testament. Und so wird jeder Christ tun, der an die göttliche Inspiration und an die Echtheit des Matthäusevangeliums glaubt.

Das Matthäusevangelium ist eines der vier Evangelien der Bibel und es ist evangelischer Glaube, daß die Heilige Schrift ist geschrieben auf Antrieb und Erleuchtung des Heiligen Geistes, also Gottes Wort ist. Und Petrus schreibt 2. Petri 1, 21. Es ist noch nie eine Weissagung aus menschlichem Willen hervorgebracht, sondern die heiligen Menschen Gottes haben geredet, getrieben von dem Heiligen Geist.

Die „höhere Bibelkritik“ will aber dieses erste Kapitel des Matthäusevangeliums als nicht zu diesem Evangelium gehörend, als eine Einschiebung betrachtet haben. Wir müssen uns hiermit etwas beschäftigen.

Dr. Charles Jefferson, Pastor am Broadway Tabernacle, New York, behauptet: Die Jungfraugeburt ist in keinem Buch des Neuen Testaments erwähnt mit Ausnahme der Evangelien von Matthäus und Lukas. Keines von diesen ist von einem Apostel geschrieben, meint er. Der Apostel Matthäus habe der Ueberlie-

ferung gemäß einige von den Lehren Jesu („sayings of Jesus") niedergeschrieben und sein kleines Buch wäre bekannt als „The Logia." Man glaube, daß die „Logia" sich in diesem ersten Evangelium befinden, aber das Buch selbst sei eine Kompilation. Dann ruft er aus: Wer schrieb die zwei ersten Kapitel des ersten Evangeliums? und antwortet: Niemand weiß es — niemand wird es jemals wissen. Das dritte Evangelium sei von einem Heiden aus Antiochien geschrieben worden, der nach Palästina gekommen — wann? wußten wir nicht —, um Material für ein Buch zu sammeln das er für einen vertrauten Freund schreiben wollte. Er habe die Dinge gesammelt, welche er von den Christen Palästinas geglaubt fand. Und er schließt seine Beweisführung, wenn man sie so nennen darf, mit den Worten: „Dies sind die zwei einzigen Bücher von den 27 Büchern des Neuen Testaments, welche die ganz unbedeutende Beziehung auf die Jungfraugeburt enthalten."

Hierauf ist zu erwidern, daß die bedeutendsten Bibelforscher nicht bloß der Vergangenheit, sondern auch der Gegenwart die Originalität, Unverfälschtheit und Glaubwürdigkeit der beiden in Frage stehenden Evangelien festhalten und beweisen; letztere haben zudem alle von den Gegnern vorgebrachten Einwürfe schlagend widerlegt. Das Resultat der sorgfältigsten und eingehendsten objektiven Bibelforschung ist:

1. Mit bewundernswerter Einmütigkeit schreibt das christliche Altertum das erste Evangelium dem Apostel Matthäus zu.

2. Das dem Matthäus zugeschriebene Evangelium stellt sich als Originalarbeit in griechischer Sprache dar. Die ursprünglich griechische Abfassung des Evangeliums erhellt aus der einheitlichen Sprache des Evangeliums selber. In den beanstandeten zwei ersten Kapiteln findet sich durchaus die dem ganzen Evangelium eigne Sprach- und Ausdrucksweise.

3. Es ist kein direkter Zusammenhang zwischen der von Papias erwähnten Schrift, die er λόγια nannte, das heißt Reden, und dem kanonischen Matthäusevangelium vorhanden. Dagegen ist ein mittelbarer Zusammenhang zwischen der bei Papias erwähnten hebräischen Logiasammlung des Matthäus und des ersten Evangeliums wahrscheinlich.

4. Es ist Tatsache, daß die beanstandeten zwei ersten Kapitel des Evangeliums in allen Handschriften sich finden, und daß es keine Bibelhandschrift ohne diese beiden Kapitel gibt.

Professor J. P. Lange schreibt hierüber: Man könnte ebenso gut das Haupt von seinem Körper ablösen, als diese Basis des ganzen Evangeliums von den folgenden Kapiteln. Die Zweifel gehören einer Zeit an, die kaum eine Ahnung von den eigentümlichen Grundgedanken und dem organischen Zusammenhang der

Evangelien hatte. Siehe Kommentar I. 3. Und jetzt werden diese Zweifel als „höhere Bibelkritik“ wiederholt!

Was Jefferson über das Evangelium des Lukas sagt, ist sehr oberflächlich, mag aber die Glaubwürdigkeit desselben herabzuwürdigen sehr geeignet sein. Hätte er nur die Vorrede des Lukas zu seinem Evangelium geziemend beachtet, so hätte er zu einem andern Urteil kommen müssen. Lukas, ein gebildeter Heidenchrist, war ein Arzt, wie Professor Kelly richtig bemerkt:

A true scientist, saturated with the spirit of his profession, careful and accurate as an investigator, and fully cognizant of the vital importance of the facts he was about to relate. He gives us, I believe, in his first forty-two words in the Greek, eighty-two in the English (siebenzig im Deutschen) without the slightest observable effort, the largest quantum of certainty and assurance ever expressed in equal compass in any language.

Ja, wo ist ein profamer Schriftsteller, der von sich bekennen konnte, mit solcher Sorgfalt sein Material gesammelt und gesichtet zu haben, wie Lukas von sich bekennt? Und doch will man ihm nicht glauben, seine Darstellung von der Kindheit und Jugendgeschichte Jesu verwerfen! Verweilen wir einen Augenblick bei dem durch seine Schlichtheit und präzise Kürze sich auszeichnendem **Vorwort,** worin er beim Beginn seiner Arbeit dem Leser den Schlüssel zu deren richtiger Auffassung reicht. „Nachdem nun einmal viele versucht haben, eine Erzählung der unter uns (Christen) vollbeglaubigten Tatsachen aufzusetzen, so wie es uns die überlieferten, welche von Anfang an Augenzeugen waren (nämlich die Apostel) und Diener des Wortes geworden sind, schien es auch mir, da ich von vorne an (das heißt vom ersten Anfang an) allem sorgfältig nachgeforscht habe, gut, es dir, geschätzester Theophilus, geordnet mitzuteilen, damit du die Gewißheit der Lehren, über welche du Unterricht empfingst, erkennen mögest.“

Dem Theophilus waren also Darstellungen der unter den Christen vollgeglaubten Tatsachen bekannt und Lukas gibt hier an, worin der Vorzug seiner Schrift vor diesen und andern Darstellungen bestehe. Gemeinsam ist ihm mit jenen Vorgängen die Quelle, aus der die Berichte über die einzelnen Tatsachen geschöpft sind, nämlich die Mitteilungen der „Augenzeugen des Wirkens Jesu von Anfang an (vergleiche Apg. 1, 21. 22), die als solche auch Diener des Wortes (Apg. 9. 8 und 26, 16) geworden sind. Diese unmittelbare Ueberlieferung der ersten Zeugen kann, weil sie ausdrücklich von den schriftstellerischen Versuchen jener Vielen (πολλοί) unterschieden wird, nur eine mündliche gewesen sein. Den Vorzug seiner Arbeit sieht der Evangelist vor allem in seiner Vorbereitung und Ausrüstung zu derselben. Nur darum ist es ihm gut erschienen, sie anzufertigen, weil er bereits früher allen Tatsachen von Anfang

an nachgegangen war und allem Ueberlieferten genau nachgeforscht hatte. Das hebt Lukas offenbar nicht nur in Rücksicht auf manche Abweichungen seiner Darstellung hervor, sondern besonders auch im Blick auf solche Nachrichten, welche, wie gerade die in Kapitel 1 und 2 mitgeteilten, zuvor in weiteren Kreisen noch nicht bekannt geworden waren. Und es steht absolut nichts der Annahme entgegen, daß Maria selber ihm Mitteilungen gemacht hat, respektive daß Lukas sich von ihr unterrichten ließ, da sie ja wohl zu dieser Zeit noch lebte. Angesichts dieser Tatsachen schreibt Professor Kelly:

Where, I submit, in the world, can one find more simply and naturally stated a greater and more justifiable assurance, as well as more competent testimony, in a matter exceeding all other earthly interests in importance! (Page 88).

EDITORIALS

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY AT CLEVELAND

The second week of May was the time when the friends of international peace were met in the great metropolis on Lake Erie. The American Peace Society celebrated the centennial of its existence. The city of Cleveland had been selected for the observance of this occasion because the president of that organization, former United States Senator Hon. Theodore E. Burton, resides here. Mr. Burton is not only the formal head of that body, but has for many years been one of the foremost promoters of the Peace movement. He is an old man, nearly 75 years of age, but although looking his age, is still robust in body and strong in voice, and, besides, so well informed on national and international questions and in touch with the leading personalities that he made on ideal presiding officer.

On the Sunday preceding the official sessions, he spoke in Trinity Cathedral on the history of the Peace Society, mentioning many men of national fame, who had been its presidents or supporters in the past. One statement he made proved somewhat disappointing to us. He said the Society had as a rule worked in *harmony with the United States government.* They had protested against the war with Mexico (in 1847), but not at the outbreak of the Civil War nor at the beginning of the war with the Central Powers. He did not say whether they had done anything to keep America from entering the war, while the conflict was still confined to Europe. They certainly did not do anything to keep Wilson from unleashing the dogs of war early in 1917. We imagine they succumbed equally to the war psychosis that seized upon nearly everybody else.

It was significant that the sessions of the Society had their preliminaries in a church. It was plain that the leaders were anxious to get the sanction of the religious forces of the country; that they felt their aims were so idealistic that they could not hope for success without the cooperation of that institution which is built on the gospel of the Prince of peace. Moreover, every session throughout the Centennial was opened by prayer. These prayers were offered by the ministers of the leading churches of the city, not excepting the Catholic bishop (Schrembs) and the Jewish rabbis. By the way, the Evangelical Synod was overlooked in this lining up of the clergymen of Cleveland; its ministers seem to have too little prominence to be considered.

To the many diplomats from abroad it must have seemed strange that our country is still so old-fashioned as to employ the services of ministers of the gospel in political meetings.

At the first regular session, on Monday, May 7th in the afternoon, an opportunity was given to the educated youth of the country to express itself on the peace question, in the "Ohio Intercollegiate Oratorical Contest." Those who had expected from these no more than the ordinary peace orations of college boys, had the surprise of their lives. Four of the five delivered themselves of opinions that must have made the ears of many listeners tingle. Not only was militarism denounced in the strongest terms, but the baneful role that propaganda played in the last war was chastized without mercy. The lies about the Central Powers, the "atrocities" that were served up to the American public, the hollowness of the spiritual ideals, about which Mr. Wilson (and the "Federal Council") prated so glibly then, received the most caustic comment.

The local papers, on the next day, had big head-lines about the "Revolt of Youth." Unfortunately, however, they printed little of the detail, of the startling things that had been said; thereby withholding from the public the spicy heresies into which youth has been falling. It may be said in general that the press did not rise to the occasion. The papers did not cover the meetings satisfactorily. The speeches were reported in a most meager fashion, and the spirits of the writers did not warm up to the great subject that was up for discussion. If the work of the press had been done with the vim and color and fulness that is given to a great prize-fight, the heart of Cleveland would have melted from the moral heat that could have been produced.

At the evening session on Monday we heard the ambassadors from England, France and Germany. As speakers all three made a poor showing. The French ambassador (as "a poet of note" he was introduced) spoke such wretched English that he could not be understood. But he was sure that the peace ideal had been invested with such vitality that it could not be buried again. The Englishman, Sir Esme Howard, expressed his country's sincere desire for peace. The pity is, he said, that there is a dramatic element in any conflict, from a dog fight to a World War, to which human nature yields only too readily. If war could be stripped of its romantic glamor and constructive peace work could be made equally fascinating, much would be gained. The representative of Germany, Baron von Prittwitz, who as a platform speaker has not achieved much ease of manner as yet, stated that he had only a day or two before signed Germany's acceptance of the Kellogg War-outlawry proposal. That England and Germany are sincere in their

protestation of peace sentiments, can be well believed; for England has all it can reasonably desire, and Germany is not in a position to wage successful war. Moreover, the German government is dependent on the support of the masses, and the laboring men hate war.

The last speaker was Dr. Fridtjof Nansen, the famous explorer and still more famous through his work for the release of the Siberian prisoners of war and the famine sufferers of Russia. He was by far the most effective speaker of the four. With great boldness he stripped the mask of sanctimonious idealism from the face of modern diplomacy, claiming that the nations had by no means learned that common morality is just as binding and as workable a rule between nations as it is between individuals. Many a person in the audience moved nervously in their seats as N. went along, expecting some kind of a sensation every movement. Nothing happened though, and when the speaker began to describe his experiences with the Siberian war prisoners and the victims of the famine in Russia, they felt that this was indeed an effective argument for peace but that at least a break on the platform had been averted.

We can not, of course, report the Peace Conference in full. Many times the ordinary hearer, who has learned nothing since 1919, received a nervous shock. So, for instance, when a chaplain of the American Legion said that "the boys" here had been fed with lies about the German soldiers—they were Huns, criminals, imps of Satan—but that when they came to Europe they found they were just as good as the American soldiers; that if they had known this they would never have gone over to fight them and much blood and treasure could have been spared. Fancy this coming from such a source! We have been reading "What the War did to my mind," in the "Christian Century," e. g. what it did to Fosdick and Hough (Detroit). These men have told us it caused them to take "long thoughts." They were not half as long as this chaplain's. Hough, especially, the author of the "Sword of the *Lord,*" was "fiercely loyal" to the Allied cause, he tells us, and Barnes's articles left him cold. He had a closed mind in the first place, and the War could never pry it open. Not so this chaplain.

There was some "heckling" in a number of meetings. Particularly when Milyukof, the Russian foreign secretary under Kerensky, spoke. Sympathizers of the Soviet regime, in the audience, protested. In our opinion quite justly, for Milyukof was entirely out of place in the gathering: he represented nothing but himself. Still the hecklers were summarily ejected; the lady hearers strongly resented the impudence of "these Bolshevists."

The most interesting feature of the Conference were the noonday luncheons. They were more intimate in nature and more candid in the admission of shortcomings. At the Wednesday luncheon Ex-governor Sweet of Colorado gave a most impressive talk. He said, we all hate war now and are fervent for peace because the evil of the last war is still fresh in our minds. But how will it be when time has effaced these memories, when our youth will succeed to leadership? To perpetuate the will to peace, he suggested, three institutions will have to do educational work: the home, the schools, and the church. The church more particularly, he said with great emphasis, for *the church more than any other agency was responsible for the war madness and bitterness:* The state preached war because it seemed necessary; the church preached war because it was a *holy* thing, it was a crusade, it was the sword of the "Lord" (Hough). And then one more thing, he said in conclusion: We must compel the press to say the truth.

The Peace Conference doubtless strengthened the peace sentiment of those who took part, and the many commissions that studied the different phases of the question (industry, justice, education, religion, social agencies and their respective international implications) must have done good work and will, we hope, do so in the future. Not a single word, however, did we hear about the undoing of the evils and injustices done by the peace treaties; not one word about the revision of these treaties inspired by revenge and carried out by force. It is a step forward to see that war in general is a thing from below and not from above. But it is a better thing to stop at this concrete case and make restitution as far as this is possible.

CHURCH UNION

Rev. H. Kamphausen, D.D.,
Editor Evangelical Theological Magazine,
Cleveland, Ohio.

Dear Brother:

I want to thank you for your timely and clear editorial on Church Union in the March issue of The Evangelical Theological Magazine, also Rev. R. Niebuhr for his challenging words on the same subject in a previous issue.

Everywhere throughout the Synod there are expressions and even movements toward Church unity. Our great principle of "unity" seems to be taking definite active form. Thank God for that!

Not only has the subject been favorably mentioned and a commission on Church Union demanded at the last General Confer-

ence, but District Conferences are passing definite resolutions on Church Union. About four years ago the Wisconsin District appointed a committee to interview the Lutherans regarding a possible merger. Two years ago our baby District—"a little child shall lead them"—the Southern, passed a resolution asking our Synodical officers to give the subject of Church Union their active attention. The same resolution was passed by the national Brotherhood Convention at Buffalo. Last year Church union was made the theme of the Missouri Conference ("The heart of the Synod"), Dr. A. H. Becker speaking on the subject. And now comes Eden Theological Seminary with a convocation the latter part of this month at which Church Union is to be discussed by Dr. G. Richards, Chairman of the Commission on Church Union of the Reformed Church, U. S. A.

On my many travels I find "Church Union" is being discussed by our pastors everywhere. I am again and again asked what our pastors and people in other parts of the Synod are saying on this vital question. Everywhere I find folks saying, "We ought to unite with some other denomination."

At Baltimore and Buffalo, I understand, our pastors are meeting with the Reformed pastors on this subject. This is a very practical method of seriously dealing with the subject. By association we best learn to know folks. This makes for fellowship and friendship. This is how young folks come to marriage. Perhaps, if this practical example of our Baltimore and Buffalo pastors were followed elsewhere and by the officials of both groups a marriage here would also result.

You have correctly said that a merger with the Lutherans of any kind is impossible. That would mean submergence for the Evangelical Synod. If any one doubts this, let him approach even the United Lutheran as you did. The above mentioned Wisconsin District Committee of four years ago had the same experience. Or let doubters read the article by Dr. Krumbine on "How Lutheranism Lapsed from Liberalism," in your March issue of the Evangelical Magazine, especially the last sentence. No, to unite with the Lutherans is out of question. It would mean submergence.

While we have a number of "Lutherans" in our Synod, people and especially pastors who claim to be "Lutheran" in doctrine and sentiment or by early training, the fact that they did not join Lutheran Synods proves they could not personally unite with any Lutheran Church in *America,* and yet there are over twenty shades or groups to choose from. The "Lutherans" in our Synod are not Lutherans of the American type. American Lutheranism and German Lutheranism are different.

But we have a very large number of Reformed or Calvinistic in our Synod who, like you, "could get along with, and even in, the Reformed Church." This Church like ours is of German extraction, children of the Reformation, evangelical in doctrine, with a strong social emphasis, stressing religious education and upholding confirmation. The form of service is also like unto ours. With all this likeness and kinship why couldn't we "get along with the Reformed Church"? And do we not in our Article of Faith say, we accept the Symbolical books of the Reformed Church?

Since the door to the Lutheran Church is closed to us, why not then turn to the Reformed Church in the United States?

Such a merger does not mean *giving up,* but *gaining* in power and prestige, in efficiency and effectiveness for the Kingdom. It would mean greater good from the same efforts. United efforts always multiply results. Five men singly could never lift a 500-pound bale of cotton, but five men together can easily. Together the Evangelical Synod and the Reformed Church could accomplish much more for the Kingdom than we are now doing separately. Surely that should be our concern. Everywhere human hearts are crying for spiritual help, millions are yet without the only Christ. Shall we not take every means of united efforts to reach a greater number of these needy, sin-sick souls? What loss of greater good this separated service! Two working together means much more than twice two. Here is the great argument for union of kindred forces,—the greater good accomplished. This is real Christian strategy and Church statemanship.

Or consider it from the standpoint of economy and wastefulness and you come to the same conclusion of *the great good and usefulness resulting from Union.*

What two men are now doing at double the expense in two denominations, could in most cases—not in all—be done by one. This would mean the release of one man and the corresponding costs for other services. Instead of each denomination having an Executive Secretary for Men, Women, Young People, Religious Education, Home Missions, Foreign Missions, Editors for their Church Papers and Periodicals, one in many cases could do the work. What a saving of men and money for greater, more extended services, reaching larger number of God's unsaved children the world over. Yes, it would mean one President General less. Why all this waste? Does not Christian Stewardship also demand Church Union? How can we commit so great a sin, wasting men and money in the service of the Kingdom.

It will not mean giving less, but doing greater good, reaching more with what we give. Indeed it would mean more giving. Co-operation and united efforts with larger results always does. The United Church of Canada has larger receipts now than the three merged churches had. Some folks will simply not support wasteful methods.

A Union with the Reformed Church would also prevent overlapping and overlooking. Instead of an Evangelical and a Reformed Church, in many places, *one* "United Evangelical" would be sufficient. We do not, of course, mean, that wherever there are now an Evangelical and a Reformed Church in the same town or section of the City, they would merge. Many would, if not at once, eventually. But a Union would prevent both our Synod and the Reformed Church, each planting a Church in the same vicinity, as that is now possible. This unchristian competition would be eliminated. What a disgrace as well as waste this competitive denominational Church building is. There would be one denomination less, thank God!

With the released men and money many of the crying needs at home and abroad need no longer be overlooked. Now we must say to these repeated calls; We have neither men nor money.

Then as Dr. H. R. Niebuhr pointed out to me in a conversation on this subject, our educational institutions would complement one another. Most of the schools of the Reformed Church are in the East, excepting one in Ohio and one in Wisconsin. Ours are in the middle West. Our students in the East would have schools near at hand. Their folks in the middle West would have institutions close by. Indeed it might be possible here also to merge and save men and money. All this is another strong argument for merger.

But, dear Editor, I am writing more than I intended, I merely wished to commend you for discussing this vital and timely question in the magazine. Others may point out many more reasons for merger and how it may be brought about. There are few, if any reasons against a merger, except unwilling ones. Or as was reported in the case of the failure of two other groups to unite some years ago. The reporter said, "There were only eighteen reasons against merger." When asked to name these, reply "Eighteen Bishops."

As to name, why not simply write the names also; "The Evangelical Reformed Church."

Yours for Church Union,

H. L. Streich, Executive Sec.

„Der Geist wehet, wo er will."

An der Stelle, woraus dies Wort genommen ist, heißt es: Der **Wind** wehet . . . . Der Wind wird aber dort vom Herrn gebraucht, um das Wesen des Geistes zu erklären, wie denn auch in demselben Verse (Joh. 3, 8) im zweiten Teil dasselbe Wort (πνεῦμα) für den Geist steht. Daraus erheben wir das Recht, das Wort des Herrn in obiger Weise umzuwandeln. In jenem Nachtgespräch betont der Herr mit großem Nachdruck die Notwendigkeit der Wiedergeburt und die Tatsache, daß solche Wiedergeburt ein Werk des Geistes sei. Nikodemus findet sich alsbald in einer Welt der Rätsel. Er weiß ebenso wenig mit der Wiedergeburt als mit dem Geist etwas anzufangen. Die Religion war ihm eine Sache der Institutionen. Sie begann und endete mit Israel, jenseits war Heidentum, Götzendienst. Israel aber hatte seinen Tempel, seine heiligen Schriften, seine Geschichte, seine Priester, sein Gesetz. Dies alles verbürgte die Korrektheit und Gültigkeit seines religiösen Besitzes. Nun redet dieser „Meister" von Wiedergeburt, von dem freien Walten des Geistes und gar nichts von den Dingen, welche ihm bisher das „sine quā non" seines Glaubens gewesen waren.

Die Zeit kam, wo die Volksgenossen des Nikodemus vor derselben Paradoxie standen, aber nicht wie er mit der Willigkeit, sich belehren zu lassen. Die Haltung dieses Jesus war ihnen ein „skandalon," über das sie nicht hinauskonnten. „Dieser Mann lehret gegen Moses und das Gesetz," hieß es. „Hinweg mit ihm!"

Die Reformatoren stießen mit demselben harten, unbeugsamen Institutionsglauben zusammen. Luther fand, daß das Herz des christlichen Glaubens eine persönliche, beseligende Erfahrung sei, an dem Evangelium gemacht, von Kirche und Priestertum nicht direkt abhängig. Er ging in die Welt hinaus und verkündete dies von Gottes freier Gnade allein abhängige Evangelium. Der Welt schien es ein neuer, frischer, froher Klang von oben her, aber die Kirche exkommunizierte ihn und übergab ihn dem Teufel und seinen Engeln. Jedoch sie konnte das Zustandekommen und den Bestand einer Kirche des Protestantismus nicht hindern.

Wenn so Jesus wie die Reformatoren das freie Walten des Geistes für eine große Lebenswahrheit erklären, so ist nicht zu verwundern, daß innerhalb des Protestantismus sich je und je die Opposition gegen alles Traditionelle und Institutionelle geregt hat und noch regt. Besonders unsre mit Kritik und Skepsis stark geschwängerte Zeit läßt diesen Zug hervortreten. Vor zwei Jahren schrieb F. G. Peabody sein Buch: „The Church of the Spirit." Darin versuchte er zu zeigen, daß aller Fortschritt nicht nur in der Lehre der Kirche, sondern auch in ihrem Leben und ihren Werken gewöhnlich den freien Geistern zu danken gewesen sei, die von

ihrer Zeit als Ketzer und Abtrünnige bezeichnet wurden, und daß die Kirche durch Bekämpfung und Ertötung ihrer besten, weil freiesten, Glieder ein schlimmes Schuldkonto gegen sich habe auflaufen lassen. Solcher Bücher und Stimmen gibt es heute viele.

Die organisierte Kirche ist mit dem herrschenden System des Kapitalismus und der Industrie so verquickt gewesen, daß Millionen ihr den Rücken gekehrt haben. So hat sie auch in dem letzten Krieg, worin es sich wesentlich um die ökonomische Vorherrschaft der Völker handelte, eine so traurige Rolle gespielt, daß die Heiden sich von ihr wenden. Sie sagen: Gebt uns Christus! Die Kirche wollen wir nicht.

Zu alldem findet sich die Kirche von der alles beherrschenden Naturwissenschaft so bedrängt, daß selbst ihre Freunde sich aufs höchste beunruhigt fühlen. Nicht nur ihre Theologie, sondern ihre fundamentalsten Glaubenssätze werden in Zweifel gezogen. Wie die Rothäute von den andrängenden Weißen auf ein immer kleiner werdendes Terrain beschränkt wurden, so muß die Kirche ein Stück ihres Glaubensgebietes nach dem andern dahingeben. Steht die Sache nicht bedenklich, wenn selbst Professoren der Theologie in kürzlichen Veröffentlichungen Bedenken äußern, ob man den theistischen Glauben aufrechthalten könnte? Oder wenn sie sagen, daß der moderne Theologe die Bibel nicht mehr als Norm und Lehrquelle ansähe, daß er von der Naturwissenschaft einen mehr adequaten Gottesbegriff erwarte, als den des Glaubensbekenntnisses?

Es ist offensichtlich, daß man mit dem Prinzip des „frei waltenden Geistes" allein ins Wolkenkuckucksheim gelangt. Das Pendel schwingt an manchen Orten wieder nach der andern Richtung. In Deutschland waren Sozialisten auf der einen Seite und liberale Theologen auf der andern Seite mit der Kirche fertig. Je reifer ein Christ werde, so sagte einer dieser freien Geister, um so mehr emanzipiere er sich von der Kirche. Jetzt aber hört man ganz andre Töne. Dibelius prophezeit frohen Glaubens ein „Jahrhundert der Kirche." Die christlichen Eltern stellen sich millionenweis in die Reihen im Kampf für die christlche Schule. Karl Barth ruft einem kulturseligen Geschlecht es stark ins Gemüt, daß Hilfe nur von dem Gott, den wir mit unserm Wissen und Können und mit unserm Erleben nie erreichen, kommen muß.

In England war die Sache von jeher anders. Von dort kam freilich die große Theorie der Evolution, um sich dann siegreich England und unser Land zu unterwerfen. Aber die Kirche hatte in dem konservativen Charakter des Engländers immer einen festeren Ankergrund als bei den Deutschen. Der mit starkem Wirklichkeitssinn belastete englische Geist verliert sich nicht leicht im Aether der Spekulation. Er weiß, daß man gut tut, an dem

historisch Gewordenen sich zu halten und nur bedächtig die bessernde Hand anzulegen.

Die „Kirche von England" geht in ihrer Wertlegung des Institutionellen, der Tradition, des historisch zu Behauptenden bis an die äußerste Grenze. Ihr war schon immer die Autorität der Kirche von der authentischen Abfolge ihrer Diener von den Aposteln her abhängig. Nicht Geist und Glaube entschied über das Wesen einer Kirche, sondern historischer Zusammenhang. Auch war der äußere Kultus bei ihr immer von mehr Belang als die Lehre. Es kann einer in der englischen Kirche sehr modernistisch in der Lehre sein, wenn er nur stark ritualistisch eingestellt ist. Neuerdings wird die Wertlegung auf das Sakramentale, die „Verdinglichung" des religiösen Glaubens, das Zeremonielle, das äußere pompöse Gewand des kirchlichen Betriebes so ins Extrem getrieben, daß man fühlt, hier ist ein andrer Geist, hier geht es mit Riesenschritten auf Rom hinaus.

Wie steht es bei uns? Der amerikanische Protestantismus strebt nach dem großen Ziel der Kircheneinheit; das Denominationelle wird als eine Schranke empfunden, die niedergelegt werden muß. Der geeinigte Protestantismus soll dann die Welt mit dem Geist Christi durchdringen. Diesem großen sozialen Zweck soll auch die Kirchenvereinigung dienen. Dem gegenüber ist der Streit der theologischen Meinungen von wenig Wichtigkeit, so sagt man. Diskussionen über Modernismus und Fundamentalismus werden nach Möglichkeit unterdrückt (siehe bei der Generalkonferenz der Methodisten in Kansas City den Antrag, die Seminarien daraufhin zu untersuchen: im Komitee begraben). Es heißt, die Hauptsache sei doch, daß man Geist und Gesinnung Jesu habe, von Dogmen werde niemand selig, und das Bekenntnis des Wandels sei wichtiger als das des Mundes.

Ja wohl, aber lebt der Glaube nicht mehr von **Tatsachen, Heilstatsachen?** Zu dem Heiland der Modernen kann man nicht beten, er ist bloß ein Prophet, eine geistgesalbte Persönlichkeit. Das war Luther auch und Kalvin und Wesley. Ist sein Tod bloß ein Akt des Bekenners, ein Martyrium, oder ist er die Begründung unsers Heils? Ist seine Auferstehung das Fundament der Kirche, oder ist darunter bloß zu verstehen, daß **die Sache Jesu** lebt? Hier handelt es sich nicht um Dogmen, die sich der sich freischwingende Geist so oder so auslegen kann: hier scheiden sich die Wege. Wollte die Kirche dies aufgeben, so wäre sie nicht mehr die Kirche der Apostel.

Die Kirchen, die sich auf etwas Festes gegründet haben, haben trotz aller Mängel mehr Haltbarkeit und Anziehungskraft gezeigt, als die, welche die Freiheit des Geistes auf ihr Panier geschrieben haben. Das gilt nicht nur von den Katholiken, auch von den Konservativen im Protestantismus. Die Lutheraner unser Landes

haben mit ihrem „Changeleß Christ" mehr kirchenbauende Arbeit getan, als die Unitarier mit ihrem „Man is saved by character, not by faith," oder die Liberalen Deutschlands mit ihrer „intellektuellen Integrität." Und der Pastor, der seine Kinder an die feste Regel einer Hausandacht bindet, erreicht mehr, als der, der das religiöse Leben seiner Familie dem Einfluß des freiwaltenden Geistes überläßt.

Der Geist wehet freilich, wo er will, aber durchaus nicht regellos. Er hat sich an bestimmte Mittel und Formen gebunden. Diese Gnadenmittel soll man treulich benutzen, sonst zerfließt einem der Inhalt, oder im besten Fall verschwindet der Glaube in vager Mystik.

The Christian World

Divorce and Remarriage

I have read with interest Dr. Spencer B. Meeser's article in the November-December *Review* and appreciate highly his purpose to dignify the marriage relation and prevent divorce. Many of his practical suggestions are most timely. However, in his utter exclusion of the remarriage of divorced persons under any circumstances from Christian sanction and his practical relegation of divorce itself to the realm of Mosaic or even pagan practice, I feel that his logic limps and his conclusion is not warranted.

First. Doctor Meeser seems to proceed on the assumption that when Jesus talked about marriage and divorce he was dictating Christian legislation for civic states in all time. That the Master's teachings are final authority I do not for a moment question, but I do not believe that he was in any wise dictating legal enactments for the regulation of society in the twentieth century when he spoke on this subject. Certainly he was not when he said that the adulterous look was the spiritual equivalent of the overt act. If we are going to be literalists in the interpretation of Jesus we must enact laws for the punishment of impure thoughts, and call the lustful look an indictable offense. It was precisely this literalistic type of mind which the Master encountered in the religionists of his day, and which prompted him to say, "The letter killeth but the Spirit giveth life." Protestantism has been a protest against the view that Jesus taught by precept rather than by principle. On this ground it has rejected the claim that Jesus and his apostles left a precise form of church government or that he required conformity in the administration of the sacraments or in a hundred other things in which we maintain that the Spirit-guided intelligence of the church must work out its best interpretations.

When we study the sayings of the Master as expressions of principle we discover his intense hostility to all loose handling of the marriage relation, and his utter aversion to any use of it in the interest of licentiousness. Here we can agree entirely with Professor Meeser. But when it comes to saying that in the few words of Jesus, which are not synoptic repetitions, he spoke his whole mind on the subject of legal regulation of marriage in Christian states for all time, then we utterly dissent. For not only did Jesus insist on the sanctity of the marriage relation, but he also insisted that all legal enactment must be genuinely humane. "The Sabbath was made for man," he said to those who thought more of the institution than they did of humanity. Can we then imagine the Master in this day saying that under no circumstances whatever could he approve any divorce, and branding some of the purest people we know as adulterers because, with no lustful thought whatever, they had escaped from an

intolerable state worse than an inferno and had brought themselves and their children into domestic relations which were strong and sweet and beautiful? When a woman marries a man who becomes a human tiger, treats her with utter cruelty and threatened murder, pollutes the domestic atmosphere with the ravings of an intoxicated brain, blasts the health and morals of his children as far as he is able, and yet may not have committed any known act of overt adultery—if she divorce him and rescue her children; if years after there comes into her life a man of noble Christian character who will give to her and her children all the beauty of a Christian home which she missed before, must we say that such a man and such a woman are living in adultery and that Jesus has cast them out as gross violators of his law? That he does not do so is proven by their Christian experience of his indwelling, and by the social evidences that they are walking in his ways. Surely to say otherwise is to be as pharisaic and legalistic as were the Jews of old.

Second. The argument for the indissolubility of the marriage bond from the analogy of parent and child does not seem to me to hold. Indeed, it proves too much. Doctor Meeser says that the ethical relations of parent and child can never be dissolved, that "no human law can divorce a son from his father." They are bound so closely, he declares, that neither "life nor death can un-relate them." Yet Jesus taught a man should "forsake his parents and cleave unto his wife"—"a more indissoluble relation than one absolutely indissoluble." If you carry this reasoning to its conclusion then remarriage after the death of husband or wife is also forbidden. Jesus said nothing in the verses quoted about the right of a widow or widower to remarry. Paul mentioned it only by way of reference to a prevailing custom when he was arguing about a totally different matter. Therefore, if we are going to be literalists we must reckon the remarriage of widows and widowers as adultery, but no one would think of holding such a perversion of the teachings of the Master.

Third. Is it not saner to interpret the attitude of Jesus on divorce and remarriage in the light of his whole life and total utterance? That was a complete condemnation of moral impurity in or out of the marriage relation; the insistence on the sanctity and the importance of the home; the declaration that all laws that tended to loosen the marriage bond met with his utter disapproval; that society could not endure and the kingdom of heaven could not come where cruelty, impurity and human degradation were tolerated, but that men, filled with his Spirit and utterly devoted to his priciples, had the right to work out their own application in the enactment of laws to that end.

W. Wofford T. Duncan.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

The Third Annual Anglo-Catholic Congress

The Living Church, Milwaukee

(*Condensed*)

It is noteworthy and significant that the Catholic life, not Catholic ceremonial, was emphasized throughout the Congress. The Bishop of Albany in his address of welcome, the Congress preacher in his sermon at the solemn High Mass, and the chairman in his introductory address dwelt upon holiness.

It is fitting at the beginning of a report of the Congress to quote earnest words from the chairman's opening address, from the address of welcome, and from the Congress sermon.

The Rev. Frank L. Vernon, D.D., rector of St. Mark's Church, Philadelphia, chairman, said: "Of unity, holiness, catholicity, apostolicity, we are moved to select the note of holiness for emphasis. . . It is high time we had an unfaltering belief in holiness, an unswerving allegiance to standards of living which are above debate . . . . Fasting communion is more important than High Mass. Confession is more important than incense . . . . First of all we must have holy priests, holiness must be their first concern. Sacraments and prayer must be the chief business of our parochial life. Our churches must be above all else houses of prayer. Ritual must be adequate, but it must above all things be sincere. Worship must be in spirit and in truth."

The Rt. Rev. Richard H. Nelson, D.D., Bishop of Albany, in welcoming the delegates, said: "We are assembled here because of our devotion to Him in whom dwelleth the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and in whom the children of men find eternal life. . . . The saints represent a great spiritual fellowship who have sought to know Him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. The dominating purpose of their lives is the same as that which has drawn us together, and we shall not depart from the truth if we define the Catholic Church as the company of All Saints who are joined in sacramental union with Him who is the spiritual Head of mankind."

The Rev. J. G. H. Barry, D.D., rector of the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, New York, and Congress preacher, continued this appeal for holy living:

"Catholicity is not and cannot be an individual thing. It is social, and the true Catholic is an energetic force for righteousness in the community to which he belongs. He is a Christian citizen. He is visualizing all questions from a Christian point of view. Not only is teaching the Christian religion an obligation we have accepted, but at the same time we have accepted the serious obligation of living it.

"I would appeal to Anglo-Catholics on that platform; the platform of a Catholic life. That we should make it impossible that we be any longer known as those who indulge in certain ceremonial habits which would be harmless did they not indicate a certain Romeward tendency, or lay stress on certain doctrines which are unusual in the Episcopal Church; but as those who stand first of all for certain fundamental principles of living, to whom holiness is the supreme quality and voca-

tion of the Christian, the reason of his existence and the condition of his attainment to his end."

The Rev. Charles Jarvis Harriman, rector of the Church of St. James-the-Less, Philadelphia, definitely defended the Catholic position on commonly raised questions, and his defense led to the larger position of loyalty to our Lord. "The sum of it all is," he concluded, "that our loyalty is not only to a cause or to an organism but to a personal Christ, the Son of God."

Fr. Harriman said the loyalty of the Anglo-Catholic group in the Episcopal Church had been called in question.

"We believe and do these things, not because they are Roman, but because they are right. They are more than Roman, they are Catholic, and the Episcopal Church is Catholic. Its name is Protestant Episcopal, but protestant is a word of various meanings. It was used of the ancient Church of England. At the Reformation she was not made new, but made free. To the jibe—where was your Church before the Reformation? the retort is—where was your face before it was washed?

"If by protestant you mean disowning papal obedience, sharing the movement for freedom, education, and individual development; public worship in English; the open Bible; we are Protestant. If you mean anti-Catholic, especially in the spirit of the sheet and hood, every man to choose his own Church, a complete break with the past, the dilemma between fundamentalism and modernism—if you mean by protestant what most Protestants seem to mean, we are not Protestant, and God forbid we ever should be.

"The men who named the Protestant Episcopal Church meant to keep to the historic Church, as they showed by the Prayer Book. They were Episcopal, retaining bishops as had been since the apostles' time, but protestant in doing so apart from the papal system; protestant in the English sense, successors to established episcopacy, not dissent. Episcopal, the name by which we are commonly known, defines our position. Protestant describes so well what we are not, it is barely honest to use it. We should drop the word Protestant, and put nothing in its place, and be known as the Episcopal Church."

The Rev. Julian Hamlin, rector of St. John's Church, Newport, R. I., read a paper, The Nature of the Church. Fr. Hamlin adequately traced the natural growth and historic development of the Church, but eloquently portrayed the Divine Society which he suggested must seldom have been absent from the mind of Jesus.

"What did our Lord leave behind Him? Not a book, not a record of His life, not a creed; but a fellowship of men and women bound to each other by a common allegiance to Him and by a victorious faith in His resurrection. It was to this fellowship that the baptism of the Holy Spirit came on Pentecost.

"Immediately the little Church was obsessed by a divine sense of mission, regarded herself as the fulfillment of the old order, possessed new coherence and unity, more adequate than the prophets ever dreamed.

"The chief glory of the Book of Common Prayer is that it has never allowed us to forget that our membership in Christ involves membership in a Christian body which is far larger than the Protestant Episcopal Church, of which the Anglican communion is but a part, and which it has never repudiated by any official expression of its mind."

The Solemn High Mass

On Wednesday morning at 10:30 the solemn pontifical Mass in the Cathedral of All Saints was the climax of the Congress. At the close of this impressive service, the congregation of 2,500 people who thronged the cathedral knelt and received the blessing of Bishop Nelson as he proceeded through the aisle.

The Sessions of the Second Day

The Rt. Rev. Campbell Gray, D.D., Bishop of Northern Indiana, whose subject was The Faithful Departed, made tender reference, before reading his paper, to the beautiful and unforgettable speech made by the late Bishop Brown at General Convention in New Orleans when he rose to plead for the practice of prayers for the dead, suggesting no more appropriate place and time than in the very center of the Holy Communion service.

Bishop Gray gave a very clear and simple explanation of the intermediary state of the departed. The prejudice against the word "purgatory," he said, originated from the abuses which clustered about this doctrine, purgation in reality being remedial and not vengeful. He said the arguments against prayers for the dead would be equally valid against prayers for the living. "The highest act of prayer is sacrifice," said Bishop Gray. "As for the living, so also for the dead, the most powerful thing we can do for them is to offer the Holy Sacrifice at the altar."

Our Lady and the Saints

Our Lady and the saints, having been turned out of our churches about for hundred years ago, and the doors slammed behind them, came back through the windows." Thus the Rev. Spence Burton, Superior S.S.J.E., prefaced his admirable paper, Our Lady and the Saints. He suggested practical methods for putting his theories into practice, such as shrines with votive candles at images and windows of the saints. Particularly he suggested praying for missionaries at the shrines of great missionaries, "and there lighting candles in honor of Him who is the Light of the world." He distinguished clearly between *latria* and *dulia*. A fine feature of this paper was the plea for Christian fellowship, cultivated and nurtured by companionship with the saints and prayerful concern for the poor, the sick, the needy, the submerged, and the oppressed.

At the Wednesday evening session the Ven. John Cole McKim, with Fr. Sakurai, S.S.J.E., representing the Church in Japan, brought greetings from the Catholic Congress there. The Rev. Robert E. Wood, of the China mission, spoke as a representative of the Holy Catholic Church of China.

Lawson Purdy, L.L.D., secretary and general director of the

Charity Organization Society, New York, expressed satisfaction in the growing desire of theological seminaries to give instruction in social work, as the clergy ought to be informed concerning social resources and problems. "Forty years ago I thought it was the duty of the clergy to preach the rights of man. I thought the message of freedom and justice so appealing that when stated it would be accepted. I saw men suffer for that belief and saw their ministry wrecked. Now I believe the clergy should first have regard for their ministry to individual souls and avoid such public utterances as may lessen their usefulness for their primary priestly function. Within these limitations they should embrace such opportunities as they may have to further the rule of right."

Dr. Purdy developed the fundamental principle of sacrifice and pain and of happiness through perfect adaption to environment.

The Missionary Charter of the Church was the subject of the paper by the Rev. Robert F. Lau, D.D., of the National Council.

"The Church could not cease to be missionary without ceasing to be. Evangelization was the justification of the existence of the early Church. It grew not by insistence upon faith and order but by missionary zeal. . . . Interest in the missionary program of the Church is the acid test of the claim to be Catholic. We must justify our existence as Catholics by sharing in the missionary enterprise of our communion. Otherwise we have a name that we are living but are dead."

Dr. Lau put some very pertinent questions, such as the desire at home for paid choirs and the desire in China for hospitals.

Two College Presidents

Kenneth C. M. Sills, LL.D., president of Bowdoin College, read a paper on The Church and Education. He spoke strongly in favor of the religious day school and of the realization it gives children that the community is interested in religious instruction, albeit the whole plan is yet experimental. He referred to the attempt to get rid of parochial schools as thoroughly vicious and un-American. He referred also with a degree of satisfaction to the faculty of the Church for private schools and suggested that they should include children from a greater range of homes, especially those of working men. He likewise referred to our Church colleges as being distinguished for graduating men of real culture.

"It is a mistake to treat the college student as a type and not as an individual. He needs a priest for the same reason the rest of us do. . . . Laymen as well as clergy should try to keep more in touch with the religious life of boys and girls in college. Frequently they have no hint that people take the least interest in their Church relations, hence is it any wonder they feel religion is of no particular importance?"

Dr. Sills emphasized the great and perennial need of better training for the Christian ministry:

"We should strive to make our theological seminaries equal to other schools of medicine, law, science, and business training. The

type of men studying for Orders is improving, but stronger men should be encouraged. We need to pay more attention to the scholarship of teachers in our seminaries. . . . It is the fault of the Church that not more men are devoted to scholarship. We provide no means for scholarly men to live scholarly lives, and the Church cannot hold its own without scholarly leadership."

Following Dr. Sills, the president of St. Stephen's College, the Rev. Bernard I. Bell, D.D., read a paper on The Church, the College Student, and Morals.

"Confused thinking and confused talking undermines the respect of undergraduates for so-called Christian morals. It is futile to attempt to make people live like Christians when they are not Christians. We live in a pagan world as did the Lord Jesus Christ and as did St. Paul. Christians are now and always have been and probably always will be a minority. What is right for others is not right for us, and what is wrong for us may not be wrong for them. We should say to the student, If you wish Christ's grace, if you believe He is the way, the sustainer and lover of souls, then accept only the ethical judgment of those who through the centuries have lived near Him and learned about Him. . . . The way to change the undergraduate's morals and to ensure that he shall continue to maintain the standards of Christendom is to make him a Catholic Christian—and there is no other way in the world."

The Rev. Charles Townsend, Jr., rector of the Church of the Good Shepherd, Rosemont, Pa., read a paper, Saints in the Making. "If we want to be saints we have the power to become saints. The real enemy of our spiritual life is commonplace dullness of routine and the lack of desire for the life of prayer and devotion. This is demonstrated by the disregard of daily Mass and the disinterest in holy days. . . . We who call ourselves Catholic Christians need to make much more of the good old evangelical truth of assurance, the keynote of true evangelicalism, without which there can be no true Catholicism. . . .

"The Episcopal Church will continue to nurture respectable Christians but will never make saints until in every parish and mission, every city and hamlet, she restores the Sacrament of the Altar to the central place in her worship. . . . The need, the purpose, the only goal of the Christian religion and therefore of the Catholic is to make saints in the image and after the likeness of the sacred humanity of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Conclusion

The official report of the registration of the Congress is that 1,033 persons were enrolled, while many unregistered persons attended the various sessions.

There were eight altars in the cathedral and Masses were said from 6 to 9 o'clock daily. There were communions at 7 and 8. On Thursday a requiem Mass was said in the chapel of St. Michael and All Angels for Bishop Lines, at which the Rev. C. N. Lathrop was celebrant.

Book Review

(When ordering books, please mention this Magzaine.)
NOTE—Reviews, when not signed, are by the Editor.

A Temple of Topaz, by *F. W. Boreham.* The Abingdon Press, 1928. 272 pages, $1.75.

This is Mr. Boreham's latest, the twenty-first of his literary career. He is fond of quaint, unusual titles ("A Casket of Cameos"; "Rubble and Roseleaves"; "Wisps of Wildfire"); so this time it is "A Temple of Topaz." This volume brings his "Texts that made History" series to a close, a group that had made a special appeal to ministers on account of its rich homiletical material. Some of the men who, in the present volume, are said to have been influenced by certain texts, are: Abraham Lincoln (the religious growth of the man is impressively described); Henry Drummond ("The Greatest of these is Love"); John Milton ("O give thanks unto the Lord . . . ."); General Gordon; Joseph Addison ("The Lord is my Shepherd"), etc. The two life stories that interested us most in the book, are those of St. Patrick and Victor Hugo. The other day we saw a statement, somewhere, that St. Patrick had never lived. We knew that it was hard "to distinguish fact from tradition" in his life, but yet one should not pour out the child with the bath water. At any rate, to Boreham St. Patrick was a real person, and a wonderfully consecrated Christian. The text he assigns him is, "For me, Life is Christ," and he draws a picture of him that will satisfy the most enthusiastic Irishman.

Then, another wholehearted tribute Boreham pays to Victor Hugo (the "crowning glory of the 19th century, and, in all ages, second only to Shakespeare," according to Swinburne). He analyses his chief works and their characters, especially the "Hunchback of Notre Dame," and finds that their spiritual message may be summed up in Paul's word: "Now abideth faith, hope, charity, but the greatest . . . charity."

The book is in Boreham's best vein: fresh, warm-hearted, exhibiting the skill of the literary artist; furnishing to preachers a rich store of inspiring illustrations.

The Heights of Christian Unity. A Plea for One Holy Catholic Church by Doremus A. Hayes, Professor of New Testament Interpretation, Graduate School of Theology, Evanston, Ills. The Abbingdon Press, 1927. 271 pages, $1.75.

The burden of this book is the same as was on the Master's mind when he prayed his last great prayer, "that they all might be one." It was written while the Lausanne Conference was in the process of preparation. The ideal that the author cherishes for Christendom is

as ambitious as the apostle's when, in Ephesians IV, he speaks of the great common fundamentals that make the church, the body of Christ, one. This unity could not rest on any set of opinions concerning Jesus Christ; it rests on loyalty to Christ himself. It will always be impossible, he thinks, for all to subscribe to one system of intellectual beliefs. If organic unity for the church is to be achieved it must be sought with the mind free from established forms and creeds; to have the spirit of the Christ will be more important than to have certain doctrines about him. In the past this cause has been slow of advance, but there are now signs that the tide is turning (United Lutheran Church; United Church of Canada).

There are hindrances in the way. Churches have different organizations (episcopal and non-episcopal); different ideas of worship and the sacraments; they have different creedal statements. If there is to come any real unity there must be mutual toleration. We shall never think the same on all these things. With some sacraments and orders are of greatest importance; with some, confessions and theological formulations. Neither the ones nor the others should be so overestimated as to preclude Christian unity.

The author takes particular pains to combat undue emphasis on the creeds. There was difference of opinions even in the bible, and all along in the history of the church. Creeds are changeable, they are fallible, they are subject to interpretation. They were adopted by majority votes; they are but opinions. If subscription to creeds is required it should be understood only as accepting that they affirm essential elements in the Christian faith; that they are ancient and incomplete symbols of scriptural Christian faith, to be subject to personal interpretation in reasonable liberty.

It will be noticed that the position of the author on the creeds is rather too vague and hazy to give satisfaction; that the apostles were more outspoken on the main facts of the life and work of Christ. It may also be mentioned that the churches assembled at Lausanne, last summer, found it impossible to relegate the creeds to a position of inferiority.

As to the outlook of the cause of Christian unity, the writer is quite optimistic. His more immediate hope is for the consolidation, or, rather, the organic union of Protestantism; and, after that, he takes into consideration even a unification of Catholicism and Protestantism. It may take a hundred years (Speer), but it is sure to come. Of the non-Catholic churches the Episcopal church is, in his opinion, best fitted to bring about a union of the Roman Catholic and Protestant communions because it has elements of both in its life and constitution.

The experience at Lausanne has somewhat shaken our faith that the writer is right in assigning the Church of England the role of peacemaker. That Church depends too much on the legend of apostolic succession, and the growing strength of the Anglo-Catholics alienates it from the Protestant world.

The author knows that organic union is still in the remote future. Our nearer task is to establish closer relations between kindred

Protestant groups, after that, to unite all Protestantism. If we are to succeed in this great undertaking, we need "humility, tolerance, forbearance, appreciation and the leadership of the Spirit."

The book is a candid, earnest, well-informed, hopeful plea for the seemingly so remote, and yet so biblical and Christian, realization of the spiritual unity of the Church.

How to Understand Philosophy. From Socrates to Bergson by A. E. Baker. Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1927, 189 pages.

Hodder and Stoughton have for some time been publishing a "People's Library," consisting of brief volumes, written in popular language, on subjects of general interest to readers who want to be informed. Some of the titles are: "Everyday Biology"; "The Story of the Renaissance"; "Atoms and Electrons"; "How to Read History"; "How to enjoy the Bible"; "The Middle Ages"; "How to enjoy the old Masters." One sees the subjects are such as would appeal to one who aims at general culture, while retaining, perhaps, a slightly higher preference for the "humanities" than for the sciences.

The book under discussion is really an outline of a history of philosophy. Beginning with the great Greek thinkers, the author passes on to the schools that sought in philosophy a means to regulate human conduct rather than find ultimate reality. Then follows a discussion of Neo-Platonism (the mystic element in Plato) and its effect on the Christian fathers (Clement of Alexandria, Augustine). A chapter is given to the Middle Ages, from Boethins ("Consolations of Philosophy") to the Schoolmen (from Anselm to William of Ockham); one to the Renaissance and the Reformation. Here Francis Bacon (the man "who moved the intellects which have moved the world") and Descartes (the "Copernicus of modern philosophy") are treated. The next chapter deals with the great English thinkers, Hobbes, J. Locke, Berkeley and Hume. We then come to Spinoza and Leibnitz; to Kant, Hegel, Schopenhauer; finally to Lotze and Nietzsche. The book closes with a chapter on Comte, H. Spencer, Will. James and Bergson.

It seems natural when reviewing a book like this one, to think of a similar one that came but only a short while ago. We mean, of course, Durant's "Story of Philosophy."

It is an odious comparison, for the present author never even dreamed of attempting such a pretentious work. He is perfectly frank about it; he knows it is "neither an original nor an adequate" production (his own words). It is true he does not succeed in making the book interesting reading. But that would be a hard task for any one writing such an outline on such a subject. He does succeed in giving a general survey of the whole field. To make the story of philosophy a thrilling experience, one would have to spice it, as Durant has done, plentifully with anecdote and a clever choice of quotations from the philosophers themselves. Besides, one would have to omit much of their speculation and enlarge only on those aspects of their systems that people understand.

Religious Experience and Scientific Method, by *Henry Nelson Wieman*, Ph.D., Professor of Philosophy, Occidental College. The Macmillan Company, 1926, 387 pages.

Professor Draper said many years ago that in the development of the race three periods may roughly be distinguished: the age of faith, the age of doubt, and the age of science. The middle ages were built on faith. The schoolmen started with the assumption that the divine revelation was absolutely dependable, and then they went to work to show that philosophy agreed with revelation. The modern age, ushered in by the renaissance, unshackled the human mind. It was the age of investigation. Science began to move its wings. The inductive method (F. Bacon) subjected all traditional data to the test of experiment. It was, therefore, an age of doubt. The 19th century brought this development to maturity. Through doubt and the experimental method we arrived at science. Henceforth only the things established by science partake of the nature of reality; all the rest is discarded, belonging to a pre-scientific stage.

If Draper's analysis is correct—and many think so—the cause of religion is in a bad way. Heretofore it had been defending its ground against philosophy, with more or less success. The philosophers have, after all, nothing but their own speculations to fall back on when discussing ultimate reality; and the authority of divine revelation and the experience of the religious soul seem to be safer guides than those. But now we find ourselves confronted with natural science, which keeps close to the facts, examines them with painstaking observation and searching analysis, and arrives at conclusions buttressed by a wealth of evidence that appear to be inescapable.

Nevertheless religion has taken up the challenge. It is the glory of religion—the Christian religion at least—that it has a wonderful power of adaptation. Not only does it reveal from one period to another ever new elements of value and strength that had not been suspected before. It also seems to be able to meet every new foe and withstand him successfully on his own ground.

The books dealing with the problems that natural science casts up are legion. Prof. Wieman's is one of the latest. He undertakes to defend religion with the very weapon that, according to many, is dealing it the death blow, the scientific method. It is his ambition to make religion respectable to the men of science. He is enamored with the method of science, which has added so much to the wealth of human life. If we apply it in the field of religion it may clarify much that is now in obscurity. It may even give us a better knowledge of the nature of God, for we do not yet have a knowledge of God that can be called scientific.

This must sound very startling to our readers. Let us, however, not misunderstand our author. He does believe that one becomes aware of God by a kind of mystical experience. He, furthermore, believes that God is something that cannot be doubted. He is "that which is supremely significant in all the universe for human living,

however known or unknown he may be." "In this sense, with this minimum meaning, he cannot be denied." We can never cognize him by theoretical thought only. That attitude, distinguished from the critical and practical thought that takes in "the total object" of religious experience, he calls contemplation. Contemplation, he says, culminates in the discernment of God. It is worship balanced between mysticism and thinking. But then he goes on to say that religious experience is just as much a *sensuous* experience as any others. If religion is not based on the data of sense it will lose all intellectual standing. If God is not an object of sensuous experience he is one of speculation only, or else religious experience will degenerate into sentimentality, than which there is nothing less worthful or enduring.

The author does not try to prove this strange assertion, and we do not see how he could. In his endeavor to keep caste with the scientists he makes concessions that will neither satisfy the scientists nor be admitted by the religious. We also challenge his claim that the existence of God cannot be doubted. There are millions of men who have doubted it in the past and doubt it in the present. It is true that his existence cannot be denied, but it can neither be proved. Since Kant, it has been generally admitted that theoretical proofs of God's existence are not compelling. Kant postulated the existence of God from moral views. To him the categorical imperative was an absolute fact in the moral world, and he felt thereby compelled to posit a God at the center of the moral universe to guarantee the stability of the moral order and its eventual outcome.

We believe in God by faith, which is an inner sense whereby we become aware of him, or have a religious experience of him. It is true, as the author insists again and again, that this immediate experience (by faith) is not knowledge. But it is not true that it becomes knowledge by the application of the scientific method. Nor is it true that it becomes knowledge by calling in philosophy as the interpreter, as Dr. Buckham suggests in his reply to Dr. Wieman (in the "Christian Century," Feb. 23, 1928). To interpret the contents of religious experience is the function of theology, and theology needs, in this function, first of all, the fountain head of religious experience, namely the Word of God; and then science, philosophy, history and, perhaps, a good many other things. At any rate, we believe the author is entirely wrong when he says that we reach verifiable knowledge concerning the existence and nature of God by science.

The writer's book has three parts. In the first he seeks to show why religion needs science. Science's service is chiefly corrective. It saves religion from sentimentality and delivers it from the shackles of tradition. In the second part we learn why science needs religion. Religion opens the mind to the whole wealth of experience, not only to those facts that are observed and studied by the natural sciences (the material world). While science helps form the habits that make for efficiency in the world of fact, religion calls to life the free impulses that make human life rich and free. Religion develops the personality and provides for the right relations between personali-

ties by the bond of love which it teaches to find in the very center of the universe. Finally, religion keeps alive the conviction that the scientifically defined world is only part of the total fact of experience.

In the last part the author speaks of the nature and function of religion. He touches on a good many points, on Freudian psychoanalysis; on Dr. James's pragmatism; on the mission of reflective thought in bringing out the meaning of religious experience; or the "emergence" of religion, i. e. the historical development of religious sense and its representatives. But what he does not do is give us a satisfactory interpretation of the nature of religion. And this because he does not have an adequate definition of God. Listen to his terminology, "In religious awareness we become responsive to the fullest mass of concrete experience"; or, "we become responsive to the undifferentiated mass of the innumerable stimuli playing upon us"; or, "to worship means to subject oneself to that total mass of stimulation which is playing upon us all the time"; or, "in religious consciousness we become aware of a mass of merged data, so merged as to be a single unanalyzed and unsifted datum."

What is, according to these statements, the nature of God but the "undifferentiated mass of innumerable stimuli playing upon us"? and religion is "becoming aware of these stimuli and reacting to them." It is a definition altogether in harmony perhaps with biological science, and in its vagueness absolutely useless and totally inadequate for any practical or theoretical religious use. In his second book, the "Wrestle with Truth" (which we may review at some later date) the author improves a little on this definition explaining that God is "that feature of our total environment which most vitally affects the continuance and welfare of human life," or "that character of events to which man must adjust himself for his greatest good." That "feature of our total environment"! What can you do with this? He calls it a "minimum idea" of God and he adheres to it because that much of the God idea seems at least absolutely certain. But why call it that "feature of our environment" or that "character of events" when only a *personal* God will suffice?

He says in one place that the nature of religion should not be interpreted by what it was in its first emergence, but by its developed stage; just as we do not define astronomy by what it was as astrology, or chemistry as alchemy. If that is a correct procedure why then tell us that God is a feature of our total environment instead of saying that he is the creative spirit, or something better yet, in the personal sphere.

The author moves in the biological and psychological field with wonderful ease. The general reader, at times, won't find it so easy to follow for Dr. Wieman is not as generous with illustrations as his admired master, W. James, was. We are of the opinion that the scientific method will not be able to solve the tasks he sets it. Still while we by no means worry about the scientists crowding religion off the stage, it may be a good thing to apply their methods and see how far we get with it.

Current Christian Thinking, by *Gerald Bivney Smith.* The University of Chicago Press, 1928, 209 pages.

This book by G. B. Smith (co-editor with Shailer Matthews of "the Dictionary of Religion and Ethics") is a most interesting and lucid interpretation of the current religious thought in this country. In looking over the subjects discussed we notice, however, a certain one-sidedness. The author dwells entirely on the qustions raised by the conflict between Modernists and Fundamentalists; or, in other words, on the disturbances scientific inquiry has caused in the field of theology. He points out the far-reaching effects it is having on doctrinal beliefs, but he has nothing to say on the great social issues of the day and their relation to the ethics of Jesus. His course, therefore, is in marked contrast to the one pursued by R. Niebuhr, in his recent book. Niebuhr is little disturbed by the divergence between religion and science, and very much by the abyss separating the ethics of Jesus from the ethics of the industrial system, more or less sanctioned, or tolerated, by the church. Smith ignores this all-important issue entirely.

The author begins his survey with two chapters on Catholicism and Protestantism. He describes the theological system of the former correctly although, in trying to show how the Catholic church maintains its hold on the masses, he forgets to mention the fact that the church keeps the training of its youth under control from the beginning to the end and never even releases the social life of its people.

According to him the Protestants were medieval in their original theology. The former rejected the authority of the church and abolished the sacramental system. But in place of an infallible pope they put the infallible bible; and since they had no pope to guarantee the infallible interpretation of the bible, the creeds and confessions of the church came to have an authoritative position. He who desired to be a teacher in the church had to accept their doctrinal statements. The difference between Catholics and Protestants, Professor Smith thinks, is less significant than between Fundamentalists and Modernists.

Modernism is the attempt to interpret religious beliefs by bringing modern ideas to the service of religion. The scientific method of inquiry used in other fields of investigation, Modernism has introduced to the study of the bible and of religion. The bible has been studied like any other book and it has been found to be less infallible than it was held to be. It has also been found that religion is a variable quantity changing with man's social and cultural ideas. The bible does not contain an authoritative revelation but is a record of the growing and groping religious mind of the race. Science, at one time shackled by ecclesiastical authority, has emancipated itself. It studies all facts without reference to a theological source or interpretation. And Modernism, following in its steps, has learned to study religion not by simply asking what the bible says but by trying to find what is inherently convincing.

Modernism, being thus dependent on a scientific inquiry that never ends, is reluctant to formulate a creed. It would be impossible to draw up one that would satisfy any great number of individuals. It approves the purpose of ancient beliefs, i. e. their intention to express what any particular age believed at the time; but it wants to revise their contents so as to bring them up to date.

The writer has an interesting chapter on "the Appeal to Experience and to Christ" in theology. Here Albrecht Ritschl's position is ably sketched. Christianity is life rather than doctrine. There may be disagreement on doctrine but we all may share in Christian experience. Biblical criticism and philosophic speculations create a spirit of insecurity. Where can we find a sure ground for our faith? According to Ritschl this can be found in "value judgments." Religion must be appreciated, not proved. If we owe to our Christian experience a feeling of security and an inspiration to noble living, then *for us* it is a reality whatever biblical criticism may say on this or that part of the biblical record, whatever philosophy may say on the metaphysics of the Christian system. In order to guard this reliance on value judgments from the charge of subjectivism, Ritschl says the objective fact of Christ is the cause of our feeling of religious assurance. The person of Jesus, the "historical" Jesus (not the Jesus of dogma) as we come in contact with him is studying the New Testament, makes an "overmastering impression" on us (W. Herrmann). This experience of Christ speaks with authority to us on God and God's plan. It gives us victorious trust in God and love to man.

But, says the writer, if only what is Christian in quality can be experienced and retained, what about the Trinity, the two natures in Christ, the atonement, the origin of man, eschatology. They cannot be experienced, are they then to go? The appeal to Christ is made by so many divergent people and churches. It does not lead to certain results. The modern theologian, therefore, no longer tries to reproduce biblical doctrines. Jesus is to him no formal authority any more but an inspiration, a stimulus to noble life. We have learned to think in terms of modern life, not on any authoritative pattern.

In a chapter on the "Natural World" we hear that the supernatural element has been eliminated from scientific investigation; that some have tried to save their faith in God by teaching his *immanence* rather than his transcendence; that Christian Science and New Thought have built their systems—and their optimism—on this. "God can be approached in all reality; he is always revealing himself; man is finite but the infinite is in him; Jesus was God, so are we; the incarnation takes place not only in Christ but in everybody." The writer believes that it may be comfortable to believe that "God is in heaven and all is well with his world," but that this optimism is not in harmony with natural science.

In the "Modern Quest for God" sanctions for God's existence are drawn from human experience. Does religion, interpreted in experiential rather than in theological terms, require a theistic God? We

find that faith in the divine guidance of nations has vanished (along with the "divine right" of kings). Again, that the God-idea is not of the slightest use to the scientists. If they profess belief in God it is for the most part only a vague emotional inheritance. We see that in practical life material comfort depends on economic factors rather than on generalized moral attitudes. Furthermore, the study of the history of religion shows that religion outgrows its theologies. God is seen to be the pictorial representation of the group idea. This idea changes with conditions. The monarchical conception gives place to the democratic; autocracy yields to the principle of cooperation. God is often identified with humanistic ideals: the "Kingdom of God."

Some sort of cosmic support seems indispensable. But since the cosmic processes are indifferent to human values, a "finite God," who requires human cooperation for the realization of his ends, appears to many to have the greater evidence on his side. Just what conception of God will ultimately prevail no one can tell; but it is doubtful whether theism of the usual type will continue to be a convincing way of stating a religious view of the world. Our conception of God must be formulated in "*tentative* terms, growing out of our religious relationship to what we worship in our cosmic environment. Men may believe in God without being able to define him."

"If the attempt should be made to define God, not in terms of a "first" cause of remote beginnings, but rather as a power residing in the evolutionary process luring things on to a better future, we might see a new theology which would draw largely on the findings of modern science."

After following the argument of the book to the end, we are in a position to examine the conclusion which the writer has reached. Briefly stated they are that there is no definite conclusion. He has no valid idea of God to offer. Whatever formulation he might suggest would be only *tentative*, to be modified or entirely overthrown by natural science to-morrow. It requires no argument to show that there was no such haziness about God in the minds of the Jewish prophets. If there had been they would not have become the makers of Israel's history, nor the authorities to whom the apostles of the social gospel of to-day refer back with wonderment. Nor was such haziness in the mind of Jesus, with whom the Father-God was the very source of his life and power. Nor with the apostles or their converts, who found in their faith in God and Jesus, his Son, a "cosmic support" that all the pressure of an unfavorable environment could not break.

Such faith can and must be found to-day by the way of spiritual experience. The main source of such experience is the word of God. Our contact with nature may give us "a certain mystical feeling that there is some power in the evolutionary process luring things on to a better future." But that there is a God who loves us, saves us, reconstructs us and will reconstruct society—such faith can only be found in and maintained by the Word, and in growing spiritual union with Jesus Christ.

VOLUME 56 SEPTEMBER 1928. NUMBER 5.

Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America

Motto: 1. Cor. 3, 22-23.
Πάντα ὑμῶν ἐστίν, ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ.

Published bi-monthly and entered at the post office at St. Louis, Mo., as second-class matter in December, 1898.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October, 1917, authorized on July 3, 1918.

CONTENTS

Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per year (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 9807 Cudell Ave., Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-18 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

VOL. 56. ST. LOUIS, MO. SEPTEMBER 1928.

THE EVANGELICAL SYNOD AND CHURCH UNION*

By Professor C. E. Schneider

1. The Church of Christ Is the Organism in Which Christ's Spirit Resides and Effects a Unity Between All Its Members

Any consideration of Church union, whether it involves the union of numerous denominations or merely the merging of a few must make the distinction between the spiritual invisible organism of the Church and the physical, visible organization into denominational forms.

Primarily Jesus did not found an external institution. Jesus dealt more in principles than in precise programs. Throughout his ministry he pronounced the message and cared little for the mechanics. That, around which modern denominations revolve and seek their right of existence—doctrine, organization, worship—was of little significance for Jesus. Certainly Jesus did not require creedal subscription or a finished theology in order to enter into the Kingdom of God. Nor did Jesus demand that members of the Church assume a definite form of external organization among themselves. He rather emphasized that the relations of the members to each other be on the basis of the Sermon on the Mount. Members of the Kingdom are not to be as deacons, elders or bishops but as little children.

* This paper was read at the last conference of the Missouri District and is published at the request of said district.

And thus, in all this, the Church of Christ is primarily revealed as a qualitative entity. Beneath the historical, quantitative present-day sociological structure we perceive the qualitative functioning of free individuals constituting a spiritual unity by the binding power of an inner organizing energy. A reference to merely historical data for the explanation of the nature and the function of the Church is inadequate. We are confronted in the Church with a mystery the solution of which lies quite beyond any rationalization on our part. It is a spiritual mystery as marriage itself and it is not surprising, therefore, that Paul should speak of the Church as the Bride of Christ. Again he refers to it as the Body of Christ, the Heavenly City, the New Jerusalem, the Communion of Saints. The Church which Christ founded "was a family, with God as a common Father, its bond of union was that of a spiritual kinship, cemented by an affection, where obedience was obtained by personal and fraternal admonitions, counsel and persuasion. Its membership were 'brethren', 'sons of God', 'children of God', and they constituted 'the household of faith.' "[1]

In this sense the Church is a spiritual organism in which, by the common faith of its members, all believers, regardless of denominational affiliation, are bound together in the invisible Church through the bond of the Spirit. Although such a unity is invisible yet from the very beginning the Christians testified to their experience of "the holy catholic Church", and even as more definitely in the Nicene Creed we read "I believe in *one* holy catholic and apostolic Church." Jesus in his prayer that all may be one, certainly had in mind first of all this vital unity in the Spirit based on a common love and loyalty and purpose.

This has been the tacit position of Lutheran groups to the question of church union. Here, where the emphasis was placed on the faith-life of the individual which binds all believers together into the invisible Church, the whole question of church union becomes an anomaly for according to this view, "the united church already exists".[2] And indeed, the Lutheran position needs to be properly appreciated. There is such a thing as the invisible Church of the believers. Perhaps the outstanding Lutheran contribution to the religious life of the day consists in emphasizing the world of spiritual values which Luther summed up in the word "Faith" in the sense of "trust" or "fiducia". From this viewpoint the German scholar Sohm made an incisive indictment of the institutionalization of the Church, devoting his scholarly work on "Kirchenrecht" to the thesis that church law and church organization are inherently

[1] Sims, What must the Church do to be Saved? p. 117.
[2] Brent (Editor), Can the churches unite? p. 193.

opposed to the essential nature of the Church. The Church of Christ represents the organism in which his Spirit resides and effects a unity between all its members. The genius of the Church lies in the nature of its spiritual organism and not in any attainment or efficiency of secular organization.

II. Deominations Are the Historical Expression of This Spiritual Organism of the Body of Christ Endeavoring to Meet the Particular Needs of Peculiar Situations

It is impossible, however, to remain standing on this proposition. An advance, or rather as some may claim, a retreat has taken place from the lofty position occupied by Jesus in the founding of his Church. The Church, beginning under the impetus of the staggering, spiritual personality of Jesus, when the immediacy of that spiritual presence disappeared, began to assume organizational forms. Denominational bodies were called into existence by the need to meet altered historical situations. We are confronted by the fact that the "idea" with which we begin wears off into an organization.

Such a process of development is not at all unique. It is the common experience in historical growth. The "idea" always comes first. The history of the world and of the church tells the romantic story of how sociological formations are the product of mental images and spiritual ideas. The question of whether it was inevitable that the "idea" of Jesus should materialize into a visible church and become institutionalized has been variously argued. Indeed it seems to lie in the logical course of sociological developments that individuals, imbued with the same loyalties and the same driving ideas, will inevitably band themselves into corporate groups in order the better to express themselves and propagate their ideas.

Already in the life time of Jesus the diversity of interpretation begins. The Apostolic church was denominationally divided into Gentile and Jewish Christians, the Corinthian church was divided into theological factions identifying themselves with their selected leaders Paul or Appollos or Cephas or Christ.[3] Similar divisions continued throughout the Middle Ages, strenuously combated by the Roman Church, but by their very existence testifying to the flexibility and plasticity of the Christian idea.

It is an unreasoned procedure, from our modern point of view, in *a priori* fashion to condemn the rise of denominations. We may see something beautiful in the spectacle of the seed of the Kingdom shooting forth into many denominational branches. A strong historical defense may be urged for the rise of denominations. The

[3] (1 Cor. 1: 12)

freedom of the children of God is not to be curbed by artificial boundaries but is assured by the possibility of unfettered historical development.

The origins of the great denominations of today are not to be traced to foolish eccentricities of strangely-minded and half-souled man. They are rather the products of burning religious fires in the hearts of spiritually minded men who were strong enough to transcend the bound of tradition and convention and to step forth into a realm of the new and hitherto unexplored. Sometimes they met with rebuff and persecution. The little group at Scrooby, England which took its heroic stand against the popery of the Established Church was forced to leave the homeland and finally landing at Plymouth became the forerunners of American Congregationalism. Fourteen miles from Scrooby, in the town of Epworth, was born John Wesley, who, in an age when the church had become institutionalized, morally decadent and spiritually cold was destined to inaugurate a worldwide movement which recognized anew the power of Christianity as an internal force, manifesting itself in holiness of life and the immediate presence of the Spirit. Thus Methodism was born. In a day when liberty of conscience was suppressed, when state and church exerted unwarranted authority over individuals the Baptist principles of religious liberty, regenerate church membership and believers' baptism sprang into existence. In the early part of the 19th century when Reformed and Lutherans were viciously opposing each other in Germany the time was fulfilled for Frederick William III, to attempt to unite the two contending groups into what became known as the Church of the Evangelical Union. And when in the year 1840 a group of German Evangelical pastors, accidentally as it were, discovered themselves engaged in the similar task of ministering to the needs of the spiritually destitute German immigrants on the Missouri frontier, what more expedient step could they take than to band themselves together for the better performance of these tasks! And there resulted from this meeting in the little log-house parsonage at Gravois Settlement Missouri, on October 15th, 1840 "Kirchen-Verein des Westens"—later to develop into the Evangelical Synod of America.

We are tempted to lament the existence of many denominations. Yet such diversity in itself need not destroy the unity of the spirit. Existing side by side, they represent sincere and honest attempts to give expression to spiritual values which historically it has been their lot to receive, and which in a rather accidental manner in each case has taken on its own individual forms. Indeed it is just the unity of the spirit which tolerates and welcomes such a diversity for it honors the head, which is Christ.

III. The Unity of the Church of Christ Becomes Lost When Churches Insist on Retaining Their Denominational Forms When the Spiritual Need Therefor No Longer Exists

We have just maintained that denominations as such need not be considered an evil for they may testify to the working of the Spirit of God in the hearts of men. The shame of Protestantism does not lie in the diversity of its denominational forms. These are the product of the free historical development which is the genius of Protestantism. Such diversity may not be essentially incompatible with the spirit which binds all together. Indeed for the attainment of the unity of the fold it is not necessary to effect a uniformity of organization. There was less real unity of the spirit in the imposing unified structure of the medieval Catholic Church than may be found among smaller denominational bodies of our day who by some peculiar quirk of history are carrying on their separate existences perhaps unknown to each other.

And yet, although denominations may be the product of the Spirit, it is possible for them to develop in such a manner as to disturb the unity of the Church of Christ. Although the spiritual needs which called many of our denominations into existence no longer prevail, these selfsame denominations, riding on the high tide of the momentum of their glorious past and revered traditions, continue to nurture their ancient historical forms. Loyalty to the denomination is confused with loyalty to Christ. Is there a spiritual need for the Presbyterians, Methodists and Baptists to continue their north and south division on an issue which was settled more than 50 years ago? We are told that, "In one of the smaller cities of the Atlantic coast stand two Presbyterian churches facing each other, upon opposite sides of the street. They are the result of a division that occurred in one of them almost two generations ago because a portion of the congregation held to a 'mediate atonement' and the other to an 'immediate atonement,' distinctions which few Christians today would understand without recourse to a theological dictionary. At the beginning of the 18th century the Baptists of Delaware withdrew from fellowship with the Baptists of Philadelphia because the latter did not 'hold to the laying on of hands.' "[4] Or is there any valid justification for some Presbyterians of today to divide on the question of whether hymns *and* psalms should be sung or only psalms.

The long continued denominational inbreeding process tends to establish denominational loyalties apart from spiritual motives and values. All too frequently a kind of denominational chauvin-

---

[4] *Ashworth*, The Unicorn of Christian Forces (p. 68)

ism develops which frequently becomes obnoxiously manifest in others long before we discern it in ourselves. Ashworth suggests that the lukewarmness and indifference toward the whole subject of church union is frequently caused by the "fear of denominational sheriffs and editors and officials who are constantly occupied in keeping the denominational fences in repair."[5] Thus it has come to such a ludicrous pass that, "Neither Presbyterians, Methodists nor Baptists could ordain Martin Luther to the ministry if he were living. He could not so much as be made an elder or deacon in the Presbyterian church. And yet he is the father of Protestantism. Carey, Wesley, Spurgeon and hosts of the best ministers the world ever had, could find a place in but few of our denominations."[6] Alexander Campbell one of the earliest exponents of church unity in America should have said: "This plan of making our own nests and fluttering over our own brood; of building our own tents and of confining all goodness and grace to our noble selves and to the elect few who are like us, is the quintessence of sublimated Pharisaism. . . . To lock ourselves up in the bandbox of our own circle, to associate with a few units, tens or hundreds, as the pure church, as the elect, is real Protestant monkery—is evangelical Pharisaism."[7]

Indeed such an attitude is more than Pharisaism it is schismatic. Any Church which by its spiritual ministry does not at the same time challenge the validity of its purely temporal existence and is not willing to sacrifice its traditions and deny itself for the sake of the Kingdom of God and the greater unity of the invisible Church of which it is a part, any such church is, spiritually speaking, schismatic for it has fallen away from the ideals of the spiritual organism, the unity of which only theoretically or sentimentally it professes. "What right," asks Merrill, "has a 'denomination' to exist? Only as a serious attempt to realize the universal church of Christ. For any branch of the Church to hold as essential anything it does not consider essential to the universal church is a crime. It is in subordination toward Jesus Christ, the One Great Head of the Church."[8] This is the denominational schism of standing apart from the unity of the "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all who is over all, and through all, and in all."[9] Such considerations as these, perhaps, led Bishop Anderson of Chicago to claim that in order to create the atmosphere in which unity shall thrive, "we must first confess the sin of schism—the sin, I

---

[5] *Ashworth*, Ibid (p. 65)
[6] Sims, Ibid p. 97.
[7] Brent, Ibid p. 15.
[8] Brent, Ibid p. 40.
[9] Eph. 4: 5.

say, not simply its economic disadvantage, its short-sighted policy, its unstatesmanlike methods, its unstrategic warfare with the world, but its sin."[10]

And so we repeat, the shame of Protestantism lies not in the diversity of its varied denominational forms, but in the reluctance to surrender these forms for the sake of the transcending spiritual values of the Church Universal.

It may be a comparatively simple matter to accept the principles discussed above. It is immeasurably more difficult to commit ourselves to some of the correlaries, especially if we should apply the principles to our own denomination. What attitude ought our denomination take with regard to church union? As is frequently the case in other matters, the theory of church union is far in advance of the reality. We may accept the theory in the abstract but find ourselves confronted by innumerable prejudices and seemingly insuperable difficulties when we begin to consider possible ways of procedure. Perhaps we find ourselves in the plight of Charles Lamb who, when asked by a friend if he was musical, replied "Sentimentally I am disposed to harmony, but organically I am incapable of a tune." We are all theoretically disposed to harmony. Just how incapable are we of a tune? Bearing in mind the distinction between the concepts of unity and union we may at least attempt to express our position in the form of several principles bearing respectively on these two points.

IV. The Evangelical Synod, True to the Ideals Which It Professes as a Member of the Body of Christ, in the Light of Its Historical Origin and Subsequent Development, Is Commited to the Principle of Church Unity

First of all then the Evangelical Synod is in accord with the principle of Church Unity. We are a church which is full of the unity spirit. It is significant that as a motto we accept the Ephesian statement "giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."[11] The origin of our Synod is not found in any factional division within a previously existing body from which we split off. We do not represent a divergence from another church. Rather, in the light of our European background, we came into existence through the effort to unite two already diverging bodies whose organizational forms were at variance with each other. This merging was proposed on the assumption that the existing spiritual unity justified such a union. The Union Church of Germany, called

---

[10] Brent, Ibid 212.
[11] Eph. 4: 3.

into existence in 1817 to bridge the yawning gap between the Reformed and Lutheran branches, was designed to comprehend the strengths of each and to assure liberty to both branches. There was not to be even so much as uniformness in doctrines and organization. The emphasis was placed upon the inner unity of the spirit which was thought to obtain between churches so organically akin to each other. In this respect we are a *unity* church perhaps more than a union church and therefore the ideals of spiritual unity should be close to our hearts and understanding. Indeed ours is not the problem of effecting a *return* or a *reunion* to some body from which we separated many years ago. Rather we were born under the auspices of the "will to unity" which, if truly genuine, will of innate necessity lead beyond the mere theory to visible expression.

Again, if we consider the American origin of our church in 1840 we shall find the same unmistakable evidence of the "will to unity." In the early decades of the 19th century German immigrants began to flood into the Mississippi Valley, colonizing in St. Louis and vicinity. Here were accumulated Germans of all classes and of all religious and irreligious complexions. It soon became evident that they were wantonly spiritually destitute. Who would care for their needs? To make short a long though exceedingly interesting story we find a number of German pastors, we know them by name and from memory, Nollau of Barmen, Riess, Gerber, Wall and Rieger of Basel, Heyer of the Rhein Society, Garlichs and Daubert ministering to these people mainly under the auspices of the Basel and Barmen mission societies. Accidentally, as it were, they discovered each other in their common task and organized into a society of pastors devoted to the cause of building the Kingdom of God. They were not interested in the founding of a new denomination but were led by the unity of their common spiritual interests to band themselves toegther. They believed more in making Christians than in persuading people to become members of the "Kirchenverein." They were Kingdom-minded men and had nothing of the furor of denominationalism. Their's was an irenic spirit, manifested in long continued relations with other church bodies. Fraternal delegates were exchanged at conferences with Presbyterians and other Eastern synods. We know particularly of the presence of a Rev. David Dimond of the Presbyterian Synod of Missouri at the Holstein Conference of 1850, and of his commendatory remarks concerning German theological learning. We recall how the Marthasville Seminary was supported by members of other denominations. Gifts were received from "Yankee" men and women such as from Mrs. Webb's Infant Sabbath School," and a Mr. Van Buren, a Mr. Urben, Mr. Scarrit. Particularly do we think of the relations

maintained with Christian friends of the East, the Mr. R. Biglow of Hartford, Connecticut and the "Society for the Promotion of Collegiate and Theological Education in the West," which supported our struggling Seminary at Marthasville with notable gifts of money.

The genius for unity existing in the early days of our church is plainly evident. Our church fathers stood on a platform large enough to accommodate all denominations so long as they were interested in building the Kingdom of God in the spirit of Jesus the Christ. It is hazardous to argue against church union by reference to the traditions of our past and by claiming that to effect a closer union with some other church body would be contrary to the spirit of the founders of our church. Perhaps our eyes would be opened if we could interview some of these selfsame church fathers and have them tell us that they were never interested in the continued existence of the "Kirchen-verein" to the extent that a rapproachment with other bodies should be avoided. These men could join hands with men of diverse convictions. The Augustinian phrase was more than a mere abstraction to them. They themselves breathed the spirit of "In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas." Indeed here, we find the noblest heritage which has come down to us from a glorious past. And being true to that tradition, we find ourselves committed to the principle of unity.

V. The Evangelical Synod Committed to the Principle of Church Unity, Must Seriously Consider How the Logical and Spiritual Consummation of This Principle May Affect Its Independent Denominational Existence

In considering this proposition we may first of all raise the question of whether in last years and decades we have remained true to the best unity traditions, or whether we have not trended toward a denominationalism which does violence to this heritage of ours. So long as we were content to nurture unity ideals and labor for Kingdom causes, questions of doctrinal position and organization were shifted into the background.

However, as we grew larger in numbers and as we came to rub up against other closely organized denominations we were inevitably forced to answer such questions as, "Who are you?" "Why do you exist?" What do you want?" "Where do you stand?" "Where are you going?" We were forced to probe into the question as to whether our church had outlived its right of existence. The German immigrant had ceased to come. Increasingly it became apparent that the reasons which underlay our origin would not longer sanction our present existence. Conditions of a new day seemed to require that we build new foundations. The literally

spiritual position which in times past was our pride has recently come to be regarded as a liability. What we need today, some would claim, is a closely knitted creedal statement so that every one may know where we stand and on the basis of which it would be possible to conduct an intelligent promotional campaign, inspire loyalties and devotion and grow larger and stronger.

The same line of argument is followed in the field of organization. We are witnessing a development in our church which is moving from the spiritual basis to that of physical organization and which may involve the surrender of a spiritual principle for an organizational advance. Certainly we sense the danger of it. The very fact that recently under the auspices of the "Forward Movement" and through other channels a vigorous effort was made to place spiritual things first through the organization of committees for the deepening of spiritual life—I say this very fact showed that we sensed the danger lying in the trend toward organization and made attempts to overcome it.

However, in the light of our past we seem essentially to be more of a movement than an organization. As a movement we are seemingly in danger of being submerged by other more highly organized church bodies. In self defense we have at times quite deliberately resorted to expansion programs and Forward movements. The "will to unity" which is indifferent to organizational niceties is capitulating to the "will to organize." With pride we consider our accomplishments, the New Eden, Foreign Missions, Home Mission, etc. In past years there have been sporadic demonstrations of brilliance so that other denominations seem to have sat up and taken notice. The vision rises in the minds of some of us that the future of our church is glorious with the promise of becoming a large and influential denomination which may take an honorable place in the councils of American Church bodies.

And yet, the virile strength of our church does not lie in this direction. The most distinctive thing about us is that we have no distinctive organizational or doctrinal features and that our strength lies in just that spiritual point of view which gave us birth as the Union Church in Germany and as the non-sectarian, interdenominationally minded "Kirchen-Verein des Westens" in 1840. We are so committed to the Spirit of Unity that we can best save our souls not by deflecting into the byways of denominationalism but by seriously endeavoring to follow through to the logical and spiritual consummation of these Kingdom principles, regardless of whither they may lead, and however they may affect our continued independent denominational existence.

Are we strong enough to draw the final conclusions? Surely

we are agreed at least to the principle that the only justification for our denominational existence is the unsullied committal to the spiritual ideals of the Kingdom of God. The more this ideal is attained the less important does the continuance of our denominational existence become. We find ourselves confronted by the paradox which is the paradox of all spiritual values—that by the losing of life we gain it.

We have dealt with this subject rather abstractly from the point of view of principles. To visualize what we have in mind let us suppose that somewhere in the United States there existed a denomination which from almost every point of view is akin to us. Historically its roots run back into Germany and its pastors and members came from practically the same sections as ours and possess the same general racial memories having immigrated to this country under the same general conditions. In organization they may differ and in doctrinal standards they may not be identical but in their spiritual temper and religious zeal, in their theological trends and ethical ideals they coincide with us. Here we may find a type of preacher and congregation which represents the best of our hopes and expectations. In other words, we here discover a spiritual brother. Would it not be a tragedy if somewhere in the United States such a church should exist and continue to exist apart from any closer fraternal relations with us!

This is largely a hypothetical case. There are some who may say that such a church is found in the United Brethren, others will say it is a Lutheran church, others the Reformed. And indeed we need not immediately press the argument to fit the concrete case. First let us clear our minds with regard to the principle involved. Being committed to the principle of church unity we must seriously consider how the logical and spiritual consummation of this principle may lead to important readjustments in our denominational affairs, and may eventually require the dissolution of our present denominational forms.

This may not require merging to the extent that we dissolve or annihilate ourselves. Unity leads inevitably to union but it does not require uniformity. The unity of the fold is not discernable in the uniform sameness of the individual sheep, for physically they differ much from each other. The unity of the fold lies in the attitude toward the shepherd. May we not live in the hope that somewhere and sometime we may find a kindred group with whom we are so compatible that creedal distinctions become unimportant in view of the great spiritual concensus which unites. It is safe to suppose that any plan of union which may eventually be proposed which may bring us into closer relations with some de-

nominational affinity, can never be founded on the basis of uniformity. Unity in variety and diversity must prevail. By analogy we think of the union which is found in the orchestra where it is not required that all instruments be alike. Indeed they must be distinctive and yet together effect a unison.

Such a unison based on love, and affection cannot be effected by blueprint methods but will develop spontaneously as we permit the Spirit of Jesus to become operative in our lives. As someone has said: "We do not want unity by machinery any more than we want truth by machinery or prayers by machinery."[12] Church Union will then result not so much from our acts nor will it be an act. It will rather manifest itself in the functioning of the Church and Churches and proceed from within—out. Without affection there can be no happy, lasting marriage. Love, the essence of religion, will alone be the basis of Church Union.

There is a legend in the Talmud of two brothers who owned in common a field upon the site of which King Solomon later built the first Temple at Jerusalem. One night, so the story runs, the younger of the brothers said, "My brother has a wife and children to support while I have no one to care for but myself. I will go into the harvest field and take some of the sheaves of grain that fall to me and put them with my brother's sheaves without his knowledge, that he may have sufficient to provide for those he loves." On the same night the other brother thought, "God has blessed me with wife and children, while my brother lives alone. I will arise and take of my shocks of grain and lay them with my brother's share that he may be comforted in his loneliness." Thus, in the morning, to their surprise, each found his share undiminished. The next night each repeated his kind deed and with the same result. On the third night both brothers determined to watch, and, to their mutual surprise, they met in the middle of the field, each laden with his golden sheaves. And God said of the spot where they embraced, 'This is the holiest spot I know: here I will build my holy Temple.'[13] May the day soon come when denominations will thus discover themselves.

What should we do about it? A union with the Reformed Church is now being espoused in some circles. Meditate upon it and think it through as best we can. We all desire more information and without more knowledge our sentiment and feelings are apt to run riot. Certainly let no preconceived ideas prejudice us before we become better acquainted with what may be involved.

---

[12] Brent, Ibid p. 168.
[13] Quoted by Ashworth, Ibid p. 98.

Church union is not a manufactured product nor is it to be attained by a program of doctrine or organization. Church union is usually the consummation of a long period of development marked by various stages. Again the Talmud says "Walking on the mountain one day I saw a form which I took to be a beast; coming nearer I saw it was a man, approaching nearer still I found it was my brother." Let us take some definite and active steps whereby we may come nearer to and better understand the genius of the Reformed church. Now from the distance there may be nothing attractive in this vision, perhaps next year some of the objections may be removed and perhaps in the years and years to come gradually, step by step we may learn to so know and appreciate each other that our final verdict may be "This is my brother."

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES FOR THE MODERN MINISTRY

By Professor Phil. Vollmer, Ph.D., D.D

(Concluded)

What Are the Churches Doing towards the Training of Their Ministers in the Social Sciences?

If the social sciences are so important for the work of the Christian minister, the next question is, what are the various American denominations doing to equip their leaders with this valuable weapon? The answer is encouraging. The religious organizations of our country have lagged a generation behind the churches of the older nations of Europe in this respect, but they are now catching up with vigor. The social gospel is fast becoming orthodox. Lectures and discussions on social subjects are becoming increasingly popular at synods, conferences, pastor's clubs and clerical summer schools of all descriptions and have always been so with theological students. An immense and ever growing social literature tends to enlighten and inspire many ministers. The social interest in the Church has now run beyond the stage of a solitary pioneer. It has been admitted within the organization of the Church.

The Social Commissions

Probably the most important agency for keeping the ministers and the church members as well as the general public abreast of the times has been the appointment and maintenance under various names of commissions on Christianity and social problems by all individual denominations, supplemented by a similar committee of the Federation of the Churches of Christ in America, and the international commission on social research of the Stockholm World Conference on life and work. The Roman Catholic Church and the Council of Jewish Rabbis have joined this procession of social progress making the religious forces of America a unit on this point. At critical times the leaders of these three national commissions work together.

These social commissions have no political or economic program. They only seek to use all available opportunities for the study of social and economic conditions and problems in order to assist their respective denominations to make a definite contribution to the social thought and progress of America which is in full harmony with the spirit and the principles of each Church. To this end the task of these Commissions is usually fourfold:

(1) To gather complete, accurate and unprejudiced information concerning economic conditions in this country and in other lands, and concerning all events or movements which involve moral principles or have a bearing upon the welfare of the people.

(2) To study this information in the light of the spirit and the letter of the teachings of Christ and with a view to discover what needs to be done to relieve and remove social wrongs and to Christianize the present social order.

(3) To keep in touch with respective commissions of the Federal Council and similar groups in other denominations, as well as with any other Christian agencies aiming at improving and promoting the welfare of the people.

(4) To keep the people in our churches informed concerning the above and kindred subjects through timely popular articles and discussions in our periodicals and otherwise.

In its efforts to realize these objects, the social commissions usually work along three lines: education, organization, and field activities.

(1) The educational work includes (a) careful studies of the social situation in America and throughout the world by its officers and members; (b) the publication of the results of such studies for the use of our pastors and people in our church and Sunday school periodicals and in occasional bulletins and leaflets; (c) special research work as to conditions in American industries, (d) the recommendation of suitable books and periodicals for general reading, (e) such co-operation with the different boards, activities and agencies of each denomination as may be in line with the commission's task.

(2) As to organization the Commissions aim to encourage the appointment of committees on social service and education in our congregations and in regional and district conferences as well as co-operation with local and national movements which aim at the prevention or the relief of wrong social conditions.

(3) The field activities of the Commission embrace sermons, lectures, Bible studies and addresses throughout the year by members of the commission at synods, general, district and pastoral conferences, Brotherhoods, Women's Unions, and at other occasions; also individual conferences and private correspondence.

The Social Creed of the Churches

As a crowning demonstration of the social awakening in the churches comes the fact that the new social convictions have come near to getting lodgment in a creed, as in every formative age the church has felt the need of defining its orthodoxy in formal statements of belief. The honor of making the first ringing social declaration belongs to the Methodist Church North, in 1908, and was soon followed by other denominations. Throughout the last twenty years these bodies have continued to express themselves concerning the social question in expository and expanded statements. In this they have been joined by the liberal wing of the Roman Catholic Church which had a long historic tradition behind it, culminating in the famous encyclical of Leo XIII. The full voice of American religion was uttered in concert when the council of rabbis began to fulfil the law and the prophets through its commission on social justice. An examination of these respective utterances reveals a significant unanimity of judgment concerning the main points at issue.

"The social ideals of the churches," were adopted as a social platform by the first quadrennial of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America in Chicago 1912, ratified by the second quadrennial in St. Louis 1916; reaffirmed by the Cleveland Conference, May 6-8, 1919 and were adopted by most of the Protestant denominations. As these principles should never fall into "innocuous desuetude, we reprint them here.

The churches stand for:

1. Equal rights and justice for all men in all stations of life.

2. Protection of the family by the single standard of purity, uniform divorce laws, proper regulation of marriage, proper housing.

3. The fullest possible development of every child, especially by the provision of education and recreation.

4. Abolition of child labor.

5. Such regulation of the conditions of toil for women as shall safeguard the physical and moral health of the community.

6. Abatement and prevention of poverty.

7. Protection of the individual and society from the social economic and moral waste of the liquor traffic.

8. Conservation of health.

9. Protection of the worker from dangerous machinery, occupational diseases and mortality.

10. The right of all men to the opportunity for self maintenance, for safeguarding this right against encroachments of every kind, for the protection of workers from the hardships of enforced unemployment.

11. Suitable provision for the old age of the workers, and for those incapacitated by injury.

12. The right of employees and employers alike to organize, and for adequate means of conciliation and arbitration in industrial disputes.

13. Release from employment one day in seven.

14. Gradual and reasonable reduction of hours of labor to the lowest practicable point, and for that degree of leisure for all which is a condition of the highest human life.

15. A living wage as a minimum in every industry, and for the highest wage that each industry can afford.

16. A new emphasis upon the application of Christian principles to the acquisition and use of property, and for the most equitable division of the product of industry that can ultimately be devised.

Facing the social issues which have developed since the war, be it resolved: That we affirm as Christian Churches:

1. That the teachings of Jesus are those of essential democracy and express themselves through brotherhood and the cooperation of all groups. We deplore class struggle and declare against all class domination, whether of capital or labor. Sympathizing with labor's desire for a better pay and an equitable share in the profits and management of industry, we stand for orderly and progressive social reconstruction instead of revolution by violence.

2. That an ordered and constructive democracy in industry is as necessary as political democracy, and that collective bargaining and the sharing of shop control and management are inevitable steps in its attainment.

3. That the first charge upon industry should be that of a wage

sufficient to support an American standard of living. To that end we advocate the guarantee of a minimum wage, the control of unemployment through government labor exchanges, public works, land settlement, social insurance and experimentation in profit sharing and cooperative ownership.

4. We believe that women should have full political and economic equality with equal pay for equal work, and a maximum eight hour day. We declare for the abolition of night work by women, and the abolition of child labor; and for the provision of adequate safeguards to insure the moral as well as the physical health of the mothers and children of the race.

Of course this "Creed" possesses no ecclesiastical authority, in the sense that it has behind it no pains or penalties. It has, however, considerable moral force and educational power. Therefore it is creative and directive. It indicates the direction in which religion is both leading and pushing public opinion and action. So to call the original statement a social creed was not altogether to use a metaphor. It set down some things which the churches stand or must stand for, that is some standards which the churches believe ought to be reached and which they propose to try to get translated into action. This is certainly a primary function of faith. Thus is an ethical religion realized. Also this statement partakes of the nature of a creed in that most of the rank and file of the churches and quite a few of the clergy, either do not know that it exists, care little or nothing about it, or make no effort to put it into life.

When those who wrote the social creed, under the impulse of a long religious tradition, mentioned some of the things that the labor and farm leaders and also the socialists had been striving for, and when later the social workers and the progressives repeated in substance the main things that all the rest had said, it did not mean that any were borrowing language or ideas from others. It meant that a common movement in American life was coming to expression. That organized religion should both take direction from it and then put into it an older sanction and power is an instance of how God is revealed in human life. Thus did the prophets and the law; and thus did Jesus fulfil them. Thus also did he enjoin his disciples to fulfil them.

The Social Gospel in the Theological Seminaries

Twenty-five years ago only one theological seminary offered an articulated course on the relation of Christianity to the organic life of society. Today there are few seminaries of first-class rating that do not have several such courses, some even having whole social departments. I have examined Dr. Kelly's book, "Theological Education in America", and a large number of recent catalogs of theological seminaries and have come to the conclusion that with respect to their offerings in the social sciences the seminaries may be

roughly divided into three groups; (1) *Progressive schools,* which treat the social sciences as an important, essential subject, each offering from 4-16 courses, some prescribed, others elective, on subjects like "New Testament Sociology", Sociological aspects of the Primitive Church, Modern Social Problems, The Sermon on the Mount, Social Psychology, Social Ethics, The Church and Social Progress, Sociology and Ethnology, Social Teachings of the Bible, Ethical Viewpoints in Modern Literature, Economics and Religion, The Town and Country Parish, Problems of Racial Contact, Modern Social Movements, the Sociology of Religion, The Survey, its Methods and Uses, Urban Sociology, Social Theories, International Relations, War and Peace, Missionary Sociology, Social Service, Trade Unionism, etc. Several of the theological schools conduct "seminars" and "clinics". (2) The second group of *seminaries proceeding on the laissez faire theory.* They offer from 1-4 courses on some phases of the social problems, but all depends on the personnel of the faculty, the likes and dislikes of individual professors. As these schools do not offer social science courses on principle, the number and emphasis changes from year to year and with changes in the professorship or the demand of progressive students. (3) A group of either small or *intellectually backward seminaries* neither require nor offer any courses on any phase of sociology, some even actively denouncing these studies, either from general lack of scientific interest or from dogmatic prepossessions, such as extreme pre-millennialism. Dr. Kelly says of these seminaries: "They are wholly untouched by the progress and method of science. They are conducted on the assumption that science and religion occupy mutually exclusive fields, if they are not indeed in actual conflict. Many of these schools could not qualify as high grade educational institutions, since they neither speak the language nor use the methods of modern education."

The Seminary Minimum in the Social Sciences

Of course thelogical seminaries cannot be expected to train specialists in the social sciences. But the responsible authorities should regard it as a matter of sacred duty and of conscience to provide the following minimum of social equipment in these serious times of world reconstruction.

(1) Colleges controlled by Church denominations should be strictly held by their synods and boards to require of all pre-theological students at least three social courses, one in general sociology, one in economics and one in the history of civilization, together with a few elective courses. The medical and law schools demand of the colleges recognized by them such preparatory courses as lead directly to their work, and the college authorities are very

anxious to comply with their demand. Why should not colleges founded, controlled and partly supported by the churches arrange similar courses for the pre-theological students?

(2) Seminary boards and faculties should make credits for the above three courses a condition for entrance to the diploma course of their schools, but not only on paper in the catalog, or as a suggestion or recommendation but as an inexorable condition. This demand should be made known to prospective theological students, especially to such as receive their preparatory course in colleges not controlled by church boards. The seminaries should not be expected to spend their precious time in preparatory studies.

(3) An up-to-date theological school should offer and require of each student at the very least one exegetical course on the social teaching of Christ, such as the value of personality, class distinctions, the Kingdom of God, marriage and divorce, the importance of the child, the moralization of the property idea, the perils of great wealth and of dire poverty, the limits of government control, on true and false patriotism, on war, etc., all of which problems were already "burning" in Christ's own time. This important course, if it shall fulfil its object, must follow the strictly scientific method of interpretation. That is, it must be based closely on the text of the New Testament, carefully gathering, scientifically classifying and honestly interpreting the many direct sayings as well as the legitimate implications of the teachings of Jesus on the social problems. No modern theories must be read into the text, nor must seemingly too radical sayings be suppressed or toned down to suit present conditions. Christ must be allowed to speak for himself. Many social errors in the minds of our ministers and people are due to the widespread ignorance on what the Gospels really do say on the above subjects Such a course must also point out the difference between the social teaching of the Old and New Testament. ("Moses said—but I say." Also Hebr. 1 : 1-3).

It is true that in its modern technical sense the New Testament does not contain a "sociology"; but neither does it contain a "theology" in the scientific sense. But just as during the past fifty years the new division of the "N. T. Theology" has been differentiated from dogmatic theology, so during the past twenty years the new division of "N. T. Sociology" has been separated from Christian ethics. The reason was in both cases the same, namely, to let the New Testament speak for itself, unmixed with the results of later developments. Under various names, many seminaries already offer such exegetical courses. This study can be made exceedingly helpful and is usually very popular with the students.

Literature for the exegetical study of the social teaching of Christ:

Kent, The Social Teaching of the Prophets and of Jesus.

Rauschenbusch, Christianity and the Social Chrisis.

Vollmer, New Testament Sociology and The Modern Student's Life of Christ.

Horstmann, The Will of God.

(4) As electives may be offered courses on the outstanding social problems, either by the seminar or the deductive, or the historical methods. Courses on the social content of the epistle of James, or the Sermon on the Mount are also very helpful.

(5) The social point of view should be stressed in other courses, especially in Church history.

(6) Applied or practical sociology should also be studied. It aims to investigate the real conditions of society in city and country and the work being actually done to improve conditions.

Besides work in the Seminaries, committees on ordination should make it a point to test the knowledge of the applicant on the social teachings of Christ in their application to present conditions.

Finally, the church judicatories should support their social commissions by sympathy, suggestions and money, for untold good proceeds from their work. Periods for papers and discussions on social subjects should be set apart at the stated meetings of synods and conferences, in addition to special summer schools and convocations, for social discussions.

The above is the minimum the Church should do for her ministers.

How to Find Time For the Social Sciences

A steadily increasing number of seminaries offering courses in social sciences show the way in which time may be found for these most necessary studies. Some of them have extended the regular theological course to four years (as in Germany) while some of our "University" seminaries stress a fourth year graduate course. Furthermore, the required number of hours per week might be raised. A generation ago the students carried from 20 to 25 hours per week and yet found plenty of time for papers, collateral reading, recreation and—horribile dictu—for allotria and loafing. Students of law and medicine usually carry more hours per week than theologians. Usually men do their best work under pressure of time. Most seminaries have made the study of Hebrew and Greek elective. I hate to suggest this, for Greek has been my specialty; but the modernly equipped minister needs other studies much more. Much time may be saved in the seminary by a better co-ordination of nearly related courses and by eliminating repetition. For ex-

ample, catalogs offer courses in Old Testament history, O. T. Introduction, O. T. History, O. T. Religion, O. T. Theology, Messianic Prophecy, Exegesis of several books, etc. In the New Testament courses are offered on N. T. introduction, the N. T. Times, the Life of Christ, or on Paul's Life, exegesis of Romans and Galatians, on N. T. Theology, dogmatic theology, history of dogma, symbolics and so forth. In giving these closely related courses separately, especially when each one is taught by a different instructor, much time is usually wasted by repeating similar or identical lines of thought which could be saved for other courses by a mutual understanding among the professors in charge.

Selected Bibliography

One hardly knows what books to recommend on the social sciences, for the amount of even the good ones is so immense and daily on the increase.

Saeger, Introduction to Economics.
Dow, Sociology and its Problems.
Emory S. Bogardus, History of Social Thought.
James W. Garner, American Foreign Policies.
Niebuhr, Does Civilization Need Religion?
Sir Oliver Lodge, Science and Human Progress.
Ernest R. Groves and Wm. F. Ogburn, American Marriage and Family Relationships.
Horstmann, The Will of God, Can It, Shall It be Done on Earth as It is in Heaven?
Herman Feldman, Prohibition: Its Economic and Industrial Aspects.
R. H. Tawney, Religion and the Rise of Capitalism.
Kresge, The Ever Coming Kingdom of God.
Ruecker, Quest of Character.
Williams, Charles D., The Prophetic Ministry for Today.
Vedder, The Gospel of Jesus and the Problems of Democracy.
Peabody, Jesus Christ and the Social Question.
Nathusius, Mitarbeit der Kirche an der sozialen Frage.
Rauschenbusch, Prayers of the Social Awakening.
Angell, The Great Illusion.

Die religionsgeschichtliche Theologie.

Von Professor Dr. R. H. Grützmacher.

1.

Wenn die letzte Form der neuprotestantischen Theologie den Beinamen der religionsgeschichtlichen trägt, so weist das auf eine besondre theologische Verwendung der Religionsgeschichte hin. Diese kommt zunächst zur Auswirkung in den **geschichtlichen, speziell biblischen Disziplinen.** Ritschl und seine Schüler hatten das Neue Testament gegenüber der allgemeinen Religionsgeschichte isoliert und nur Zusammenhänge mit dem Alten Testament anerkannt. Auch bei D. F. Strauß trat die allgemeine Religionsgeschichte als Quelle der neutestamentlichen „Mythen" noch zurück. Dagegen hatte schon der Rationalismus wie der junge Schelling und eine Reihe „Symbolisten" im Anfang des 19. Jahrhunderts das Alte und Neue Testament in starke Abhängigkeit von heidnischen Religionen gestellt. Diese Behauptung wurde in der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts besonders von dem Orientalisten **Lagarde** (1827—1892) in Göttingen aufgenommen, der dort gleichzeitig mit Ritschl wirkte. Er gewann Einfluß auf eine ganze Reihe von jüngeren Theologen. Lagarde stellte auch schon die prinzipielle Forderung einer rein religionsgeschichtlichen Behandlung des Christentums auf. Er verlangte die Ersetzung der Theologie durch eine allgemeine Religionswissenschaft: „Die Theologie ist nicht eine philosophische, sie ist ausschließlich eine historische Disziplin." „Komparative Religionswissenschaft gilt es zu treiben." Außerdem widmeten sich eine ganze Reihe von **klassischen Philologen** unter Führung Useners und Reitzensteins, der religionsgeschichtlichen Untersuchung des Urchristentums.

Unter diesen Einflüssen wurde das Alte wie das Neue Testament seit dem Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts einer religionsgeschichtlichen Betrachtungsweise auch innerhalb der Theologie unterworfen. Bis dahin hatte auf kritischer Seite in den alttestamentlichen Disziplinen **Wellhausen** und seine zahlreiche Schule die Herrschaft gehabt. Seine Methode war die literarische Quellenkritik. Auf Grund ihrer entwarf er ein Bild der Geschichte Israels, welche diese ganz in das Schema des religionsgeschichtlichen Evolutionismus einstellte. Wie alle Religion, besonders die altarabische, sollte sich auch die israelitische von primitiven Anfängen über den Polytheismus allmählich zum Monotheismus entfaltet haben. In diesem Sinn trug auch schon die Wellhausensche Behandlung des Alten Testaments einen revolutionistisch-religionsgeschichtlichen Charakter.

Die eigentliche religionsgeschichtliche Behandlung des Alten Testaments wollte aber seine Stoffe und Erzählungen besonders über die Ur- und Endzeit, auf außerbiblische Quellen zurückführen. In dieser Richtung wurde **Gunkel** in seinem Buch „Schöpfung und

Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit" (1895) wegweisend. Andre wie besonders **Greßmann** setzten diese Arbeit fort. Dieser entwickelte auch die leitenden Grundsätze. „Das Axiom der religionsgeschichtlichen Schule lautet: Es gibt keinen Stoff in der Welt, der nicht seine Vorgeschichte, keinen Begriff, der nicht seine Anknüpfungspunkte hätte. Dieser Grundsatz gilt auch für die großen und zentralen Erscheinungen wie die israelitischen Propheten oder die Entstehung des Christentums." Nach Greßmann gilt das Axiom der Entwicklung auch für die alt- und neutestamentliche Geschichte, und zwar in dem Sinn, das sich hier die Entwicklung genau so vollzogen hat, wie auf allen übrigen Gebieten. „Für den theologischen Historiker gelten keine andern Grundsätze als für den profanen, natürlich mutatis mutandis." **Damit erneuert Greßmann die „Voraussetzungslosigkeit" von Strauß und unterstellt die theologische Arbeit dem Dogma des Evolutionismus.** Bei dieser Voraussetzung ist es nur natürlich, daß entscheidende supranaturale Vorstellungen im Alten Testament wie etwa der Messianismus und die Eschatologie aus fremden Quellen hergeleitet wurde.

Diese Methode wendeten Männer wie Wrede (†), Weinel (Jena), Heitmüller (†) und besonders Bousset (†) auf das Neue Testament an. Besonders die metaphysisch-heilsgeschichtlichen Ueberlieferungen wie Jungfrauengeburt, Auferstehung, Himmelfahrt wurden zu Abwandlungen heidnischer Mythen von der wunderbaren Geburt großer Männer, vom sterbenden und auferstehenden Gott. Die Sakramente stammten aus den Mysterien-Religionen. Von der Christologie erklärte Weinel: „Die Christologie war fast fertig, ehe Jesus auf die Erde kam! **Die schärfste zusammenfassende Formel für die religionsgeschichtliche Betrachtung des Christentums gab Gunkel in dem Satz: „Das Christentum ist eine synkretistische Religion."**

Aber auch diese Männer blieben ihrer persönlichen Ueberzeugung nach christliche Theologen und wollten darum im Christentum ein ihm allein eignendes charakteristisches Element herausarbeiten, an welches sich der spezifisch christliche Glaube noch in der Gegenwart heften kann. Dieses Element sollte der **„historische Jesus"** sein. Infolgedessen erscheinen Ende des 19. und Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts eine ganze Anzahl historischer Jesusbilder, von denen neben Harnacks Aufstellungen dasjenige **Boussets** in den Religionsgeschichtlichen Volksbüchern das bekannteste wurde. Als Inhalt dieser historischen Leben-Jesu-Forschung kann man etwa folgende Züge nennen. Jesus hat eine Reihe von Reinigungen und Reduktionen an den überlieferten Religion Israels vorgenommen. Seine eigentliche Bedeutung aber liegt darin, daß er die allgemeine sittliche Menschheitsreligion, das heißt den Glauben an Gott,

die Unsterblichkeit und die Tugendübung in besonders kräftiger ja einzigartiger Weise in seiner Seele und Persönlichkeit vollzogen hat. Das gibt den Anlaß ihn auch heute noch als unsern Führer zu werten, ihn auch Mittler zu nennen, ja ein persönliches Verhältnis zu ihm zu behaupten. Wofür Jesus sich selbst hielt, bleibt im Dunkeln; wahrscheinlich hat er in einer besondern Situation seines Lebens zu dem Gedanken gegriffen, er sei der Menschensohn, der Messias. In Wirklichkeit aber ging — metaphysisch beurteilt — seine Persönlichkeit nicht über Menschenmaß hinaus.

So glaubte die religionsgeschichtliche Theologie auf geschichtlichem, religionsvergleichendem Weg den „historischen Jesus" sicher herauszuarbeiten und in ihm auch den Träger der christlichen Gegenwartsreligion zu erfassen. Allein weder die Wissenschaft noch der Glaube beruhigten sich lange bei diesem „historischen Jesus." Rein historisch kritisch angesehen, schien nämlich kein wirklicher Anlaß gerade diese Züge aus der biblischen Ueberlieferung für historisch glaubwürdiger zu halten, zumal die Urteile der einzelnen Forscher stark auseinander gingen. Dazu kam die merkwürdige Aehnlichkeit der übriggebliebenen „historischen" Züge mit religiösen Gegenwartsidealen. Endlich aber konnte sich ein wirklich religiöser Glaube nicht auf einen einfachen, der Vergangenheit angehörigen, Menschen statt auf den lebendigen, gegenwärtigen Gott richten. **Infolgedessen vollzog sich innerhalb der religionsgeschichtlichen Theologie selbst ein radikaler Umschwung. Man gab die historische Methode und den „historischen Jesus" preis und setzte an seine Stelle ein Christussymbol, das sich auf die Vernunft begründete.**

Dieser Wendung gab Bousset in einem Vortrag auf dem Weltkongreß für freies Christentum, 1910, Ausdruck über: „Die Bedeutung der Person Jesu für den Glauben. Historische und rationale Grundlagen des Glaubens." Prinzipiell stellt er fest: „So weist die Historie, ernst und nachhaltend betrieben, über sich selbst hinaus und zwingt uns ein anders Fundament außerhalb ihrer zu suchen und das wäre die Ratio." **Der Historismus dankt hier zu Gunsten des Rationalismus ab und kehrt damit zu der geistigen Einstellung des 18. Jahrhunderts zurück.** Die Frage nach der Existenz und Erkennbarkeit des historischen Jesus spielt keine beherrschende Rolle mehr; sein Bild ist untrennbar aus „Dichtung und Wahrheit" zusammengesetzt. Als solches bleibt es ein erhabenes, künstlerisch-religiöses Symbol für den Glauben: „Der Glaube kann nicht verloren gehen, denn er ruht auf seinen eigenen ewigen Fundamenten und überdies würde das Bild Jesu in den Evangelien dennoch stehen bleiben und wenn auch nur als eine große Dichtung, so doch als Dichtung von ewiger, symbolischer Bedeutung." In der religionsgeschichtlichen Thelogie lebt der Rationalismus, der Aesthe-

tizismus des jungen Schleiermacher, die Christusidee der älteren liberalen Thelogie besonders diejenige von D. F. Strauß wieder auf.

Diese Rückwendung der religionsgeschichtlichen Theologie ist stark beeinflußt durch die allgemeine Abwendung des modernen Geistes von der Geschichte und der Rückkehr zur Philosophie zu Beginn des 20. Jahrunderts. Am schärfsten gab ihr der Karlsher Philosoph **Artur Drews** Ausdruck, der in den Bahnen seines Lehrers, E. von Hartmann, in seiner „Christusmythe" die Existenz des historischen Jesus überhaupt leugnete, um an ihre Stelle die zeitlose Christusidee zu setzen. **Infolgedessen wurde aus der religionsgeschichtlichen Theologie eine religionsphilosophische.** Ihr charakteristischer Vertreter wurde nicht ein historischer Theologe, sondern ein systematischer, nicht ein Religionsgeschichtler, sondern ein Religionsphilosoph: Troeltsch.

2.

Ernst Troeltsch (1865—1923) war ein Schüler Ritschls und Schleiermachers. Er kombinierte ihre Auffassung von dem Wesen der Religion und teilte mit ihnen zunächst „die einfache Glaubensvorstellung von der Wahrheitsgeltung des Christentums." Bald aber schien ihm diese durch die Entwicklung der modernen Religionsgeschichte gefährdet und er sah sich zu **geschichts- und religionsphilosophischen Untersuchungen** gedrängt. Er untersuchte die Frage nach dem Wesen, der Selbständigkeit und Wahrheit der Religion. Er betonte schon dabei — in stärkerem Anschluß an Hegel und die ältere liberale Theologie — die Bedeutung der Metaphysik für die Religion. In entschiedener Abwehr der modernen Gegenströmungen trat er für die **Selbständigkeit und Wahrheit des Theismus** ein. Gegenüber den Versuchen der sozialistisch-materialistischen Religionsphilosophie, die Religion zu einem Produkt materialistisch-wirtschaftlicher Bewegungen zu machen, trat er für die Eigenständigkeit der Religion ein. Auch später als Philosoph hat Troeltsch diese religiöse Position nicht nur theoretisch, sondern auch mit persönlicher kraftvoller Ueberzeugung festgehalten.

Auch seine Verhältnisbestimmung von Christentum und Religionsgeschichte erwächst letztlich aus **apologetischen Motiven.** Sagt er doch in seiner theologisch wichtigsten Schrift „Die Absolutheit des Christentums und die Religionsgeschichte" (1902): „Es handelt sich darum, in erster Linie die Normativität des Christentums von der Religionsgeschichte aus zu gewinnen." Oder wie es an andrer Stelle heißt: „Die erste Aufgabe einer religionsgeschichtlich orientierten Dogmatik muß darin bestehen, zunächst von der Religionsvergleichung her geschichtsphilosophisch die prinzipielle und allgemeine Höchstgeltung des Christentums **für unsre Kultur und Le-**

benskreis zu erweisen." Die Begründung der christlichen Wahrheit auf eine spezielle Offenbarung und ihre Erfahrung hält Troeltsch für ebenso unmöglich, wie das Festhalten an der Absolutheit der christlichen Religion. Unter ihr versteht er die Auffassung, daß das Christentum auch in aller Zukunft die einzig wahre Religion für die ganze Menschheit sein und bleiben werde. An die Stelle dieses „naiven Absolutheitsanspruches" des Glaubens, soll der wissenschaftliche Erweis der gegenwärtigen Höchststellung des Christentums für unsern europäisch-amerikanischen Kulturkreis treten. Anlaß zu dieser Stellungnahme gibt Troeltsch die **moderne historische Denkweise.** Denn diese stellt alle Erscheinungen in einen kausalen Zusammenhang und gestattet auch dem Christentum keine Sonderstellung. Sie läßt überall nur die gleichen Kräfte wirken und schließt eine besondre supranaturale Offenbarung aus. Wie alle Geschichte ein stetes Werden ist, so auch die des Christentums. Während aber der historische Evolutionismus zu einer völligen Relativierung auch der Christentumsansprüche führt, will Troeltsch durch geschichtsphilosophische Erwägungen wenigstens **die Höchstellung des Christentums in der Gegenwart erweisen.** Er findet in der Geschichte, speziell in der Religionsgeschichte nur eine geringe Zahl typischer Erscheinungen, nämlich „die aus gemeinsamen Stamm erwachsenen Religionen des Judentums, Christentums, Islams, anderseits die großen östlichen Religionen, den Brahmanismus und vor allem den Buddhismus." Aus einer vergleichenden Ueberschau dieser Religionstypen soll sich von selbst ein Wertmaßstab erzeugen, dessen Anwendung zu dem Resultat führt: „Das Christentum ist in der Tat unter den großen Religionen die stärkste und gesammeltste Offenbarung der personalistischen Religiosität." Von diesem Maßstab und seiner Anwendung muß allerdings Troeltsch selbst zugestehen: „Ein solcher Maßstab ist freilich Sache der persönlichen Ueberzeugung und in letzter Hinsicht ruht die Entscheidung für das Christentum auch als höchste Religion in der Gegenwart auf einer axiomatischen Tat."

Ist das aber richtig, so endet Troeltsch bei derselben Begründung, wie sie stets die kirchliche Theologie gegeben hat. **Die Ueberzeugung von der Wahrheit des Christentums ruht auch hier nicht auf einem wissenschaftlichen, auch nicht auf einem religionsgeschichtlichen Beweis, sondern auf Glauben und persönlicher Entscheidung.** Steht es aber so, dann hat der Glaube gar keinen Anlaß sich mit religionsgeschichtlicher Spitzenstellung des Christentums zu begnügen, sondern er kann seiner vollen Absolutheit damit für alle Zukunft gewiß bleiben. Denn die „moderne historische Methode" und der historische Evolutionismus sind nur Erscheinungen einer die Eigenart des Christentums von vornherein unmöglichmachenden Weltanschauung. Wie schon bei Strauß festgestellt wurde, handelt

es sich nicht um eine historisch-exakte Methode auf der einen und eine dogmatisch-phantastische auf der andern Seite. Vielmehr prallen zwei dogmatische Weltanschauungen aufeinander, die sich beide auf eine „axiomatische Tat" begründen.

Die eigentliche **Aufgabe der Dogmatik** ist nach Troeltsch die Bestimmung des **Wesens des Christentums.** Sie läßt sich nicht einfach auf historischem Weg lösen, wie das Ritschl und die Vertreter des „historischen Jesus" meinten, sondern auch sie ist eine religionsphilosophische Schöpfung. „Wesensbestimmung ist Wesensgestaltung. Die jeweilige Wesensbestimmung ist die jeweilige historische Neugestaltung des Christentums." In seiner aus dem Nachlaß herausgegebenen „Glaubenslehre" (1925) — nach einer Heidelberger Vorlesung aus dem Jahr 1911—1912 — ist „das Christentum die entscheidende und prinzipielle Wendung zur Persönlichkeitsreligion." Jesus ist selber das Zentrum der erlösenden Selbstoffenbarung Gottes. Mit einem Wort gefaßt, kann man das Christentum bezeichnen als das „Prinzip der religiösen Wiedergeburt oder Höhergeburt zu einem Reich des gotterfüllten Geistes." Diese neuprotestantische Wesensbestimmung des Christentums, welche Schleiermacher, besonders Rothe mit Ritschl verknüpft, kontrastiert Troeltsch selbst mit der altprotestantischen: „Das Wesen des freien Christentums wird man in Kürze mit folgenden zwei Merkmalen bezeichnen können: Es ersetzt erstlich die kirchlich-autoritative Bindung durch eine aus der Kraft des überlieferten Gemeingeistes sich frei und individuell bildende Innerlichkeit; es verwandelt zweitens die alte christliche Grundidee einer wunderbaren Heilung der durch die Sünde tötlich infizierten Menschheit in den Gedanken einer erlösenden Erhebung und Besserung der Persönlichkeit durch die Gewinnung eines höheren Personenlebens aus Gott." **Der kirchliche Zug wird mithin durch den individuellen, die religiös-supranaturale Versöhnung der Sünde durch eine evolutionistische Persönlichkeitsentwicklung, die enger mit Gott verknüpft, ersetzt.**

Zu der Aufgabe des „historischen Jesus" zu Gunsten einer Christusidee hat auch Troeltsch und zwar wesentlich in der Richtung von Bousset Stellung genommen. Auch ihm genügt **die Idee von einem persönlichen Erlöser,** die er sozial-psychologisch begründet. Die Vorstellung einer Persönlichkeit bindet sozial und kultisch einen Kreis von Menschen viel enger zusammen als eine bloße abstrakte Idee oder ein blasses Ideal. Auch hier grenzt Troeltsch die neuprotestantische Auffassung sehr bestimmt von der altprotestantischen ab und zwar mit folgendem Zugeständnis: „Es ist in voller Klarheit und Bestimmtheit zu sagen, daß eine wirkliche innere Notwendigkeit der geschichtlichen Person Jesu für das Heil nur bei der altkirchlich rechtgläubigen Erlösungs-, Autoritäts- und Kirchenidee

besteht." Danach ist nicht nur die Gottheit, sondern auch die Menschheit Christi als einer historischen Persönlichkeit durch den Neuprotestantismus nicht mehr gesichert.

Zusammenfassend wird danach bei Troeltsch die Absolutheit des Christentums durch seine geschichtliche Höchststellung in der Gegenwart und in unserm Kulturkreis ersetzt, aber auch diese nicht streng wissenschaftlich erwiesen, sondern nur durch eine axiomatische Glaubenstat festgestellt. Die religionsphilosophische Konstruktion des Christentums gibt ihm zum Inhalt eine sittlich-religiöse Höherentwicklung und Reinigung des Menschen. Nur die Idee eines „historischen Jesus" läßt sich als sozialpsychologisch wertvoll erkennen, die wirkliche Menschheit Jesu aber ebensowenig dogmatisch begründen wie seine Gottheit.

3.

Ebenso stark als der Dogmatik hat Troeltsch sein Interesse der **Ethik** und ihrem Verhältnis zur modernen Kultur zugewandt. Darüber hat er vor allem in dem großen Werk **„Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen"** (1912) gehandelt. Die urchristliche Ethik soll wesentlich asketisch, transzendent und eschatologisch gerichtet sein. „Es ist ein Ideal, das eine neue Welt zu seiner vollen Durchführung verlangt, die entsprechend Jesus auch in dem Gottesreich verkündet hat, aber es ist ein Ideal, das in der dauernden irdischen Welt nicht ohne Kompromiß durchführbar ist." Ein solcher Kompromiß liegt sowohl in der doppelten Ethik des Katholizismus, wie in der Unterscheidung zwischen Amts- und Personalmoral im Luthertum vor. Die spiritualistischen Sekten lehnen auf Grund der Bergpredigt jeden Kompromiß ab, verzichten aber damit auf alle Kulturwirkungen. In der Gegenwart erscheint für Troeltsch das Verhältnis zwischen christlicher Ethik und Kultur völlig ungeklärt. „Unter diesen Umständen ist das Ergebnis unsrer Untersuchung die Einsicht in die problematische Lage aller christlich-sozialen Arbeit. Soll es eine christlich-soziale Bemeisterung der Lage geben, so werden hier neue Gedanken nötig sein, die noch nicht gedacht sind." Aber im Grund steht für Troeltsch doch schon fest, daß die christliche Ethik allein nicht in der Lage ist, die moderne Kultur sittlich zu bemeistern, sondern zur Ergänzung ihrer religiösen Einseitigkeit einer mit ihr vereinbarten Kulturethik bedarf. „Das christliche Ethos kann für sich allein nicht leben in einer dauernden Welt." **Troeltsch gibt mithin auch die Absolutheit der christlichen Ethik auf.** Das Schleiermachersche und besonders Rothesche Programm einer christlichen Kulturethik begegnet bei Troeltsch einem starken Skeptizismus hinsichtlich seiner Durchführbarkeit. Der neuprotestantische Kulturprotestantismus arbeitet selbst an seiner Auflösung.

Das Christentum hat nach Troeltsch **drei religiös-ethische Sozialformen** hervorgebracht: **die Kirche, die Sekte, die Mystik.** Diese drei Formen werden geschichtlich wie prinzipiell nebeneinander und einander gleich gestellt. Auch die Absolutheit der Kirche wird in dem Sinn von Troeltsch aufgegeben, daß sie durch die Sekte und die rein individualistische Mystik ergänzt wird.

Alle dogmatischen, ethischen, soziologischen Umgestaltungen des Christentums läßt Troeltsch durch die **moderne Kultur** bedingt sein. Ihrer Entstehung hat er den umfangreichen Band „Protestantisches Christentum und Kirche in der Neuzeit" (in „Kultur der Gegenwart," Teil 4, 2. Auflage, 1909) gewidmet und seine Resultate kurz zusammengefaßt in „Die Bedeutung des Protestantismus für die Entstehung der modernen Welt" (1911). Nach Troeltsch ist seit dem 18. Jahrhundert ein moderner Kulturtypus erwachsen, der neben die Kultur der Antike und des Mittelalters tritt. Formell läßt sich allerdings diese Kultur positiv nur durch Individualismus, Autonomie, Diesseitigkeitstendenz charakterisieren, während „die Inhalte des autonom Entwickelten und Angeeigneten grundverschieden sind. Es tritt eine zunehmende Kompliziertheit und Widerspruchsfülle in der modernen Welt ein." **Im Verhältnis zu dieser modernen Kultur erscheint der Altprotestantismus durchaus unmodern,** wie die charakteristische These formuliert: **„Der Protestantismus ist zuerst und in seinen wesentlichen Grundzügen und Ausprägungen eine Umformung der mittelalterlichen Idee."** Besonders unmodern ist das Luthertum mit seinem Supranaturalismus, Pessimismus, seiner Geschichtlichkeit und Kirchlichkeit. Moderner ist schon das vom Humanismus stärker beeinflußte Reformiertentum, noch moderner sind die Spiritualisten mit ihrer Auflösung der supranaturalen und historischen Elemente im Christentum. Im einzelnen schließt sich Troeltsch hier an Rothe, Strauß, Lagarde und vor allen Dingen an den Philosophen Dilthey an. Diese Ausführung über den Altprotestantismus sollen die Notwendigkeit eines Neuprotestantismus in dem früher charakterisierten Sinn begründen, der sich wesentlich mit dem Rationalismus des 18. Jahrhunderts deckt: „Gott, Freiheit, Unsterblichkeit sind die symbolischen Bücher des neuen Protestantismus, und das menschliche Leben Jesu ist seine Christologie." Aber von diesem Neuprotestantismus muß Troeltsch selbst zugestehen: „Eine geschlossene Gestalt seines religiösen Gedankens und seiner Ethik hat er nicht gefunden." Troeltsch hat sie ihm nicht gegeben zumal er selbst zuletzt von der Theologie zur Philosophie übergegangen ist. Aber auch kein andrer Theologe hat diese Aufgabe bisher erfolgreich übernommen. **Die spezifisch neuprotestantisch religionsgeschichtlich-religionsphilosophische Theologie ist schon an das Ende ihrer Entwicklung gelangt.**

Die jungfräuliche Geburt Jesu.

Von Dr. C. Schieler.

(Schluß.)

Der Bericht des Lukas läßt aber absolut keinen Zweifel zu:

1. Daß die Jungfrau Maria verlobt war mit einem Mann mit Namen Joseph aus dem Hause Davids;

2. daß der Sohn, den Maria gebären soll, Gottes des Höchsten Sohn genannt werden wird;

3. daß dieser ihr Sohn über das Haus Jakob König sein und seines Königreichs kein Ende sein werde;

4. daß Joseph nicht der leibliche Vater Jesu ist, sondern daß in Maria der Heilige Geist, die Kraft des Höchsten, wie der Engel ausdrücklich hervorhebt, die Menschwerdung des Sohnes Gottes bewirkt hat; daraus folgt

5. daß auch das von Maria „geborene Heilige" Sohn Gottes genannt wird.

Sehr bezeichnend für unsre Frage ist der Einwand, den Maria auf die erste Ankündigung des Engels erhebt: Wie wird das sein, da ich keinen Mann erkenne. Darauf erklärt dann der Engel das Geheimnis: empfangen vom Heiligen Geist, geboren von der Jungfrau Maria.

Der ganze Bericht atmet eine wunderbare Klarheit. Maria wird durch des Engels unerwartete Anrede an sie als die Begnadigte (κεχαριτωμένη) bei ihrer Demut in Verwirrung gesetzt. Da diese aber völlig geziemend und deshalb kein Anzeigen von Unglauben ist, so kann der Engel sofort zu seiner Ankündigung fortschreiten. Ihr wunderbarer Inhalt übersteigt alles menschliche Denken und schließt eine große Freudenbotschaft in sich. Für Maria war sie dadurch verständlich, daß sie sich aus lauter Worten der alttestamentlichen Verheißung für ihr Volk und Haus zusammensetzte. Insbesondre mußte die Anlehnung an das bei Jesaia von dem Jungfrauensohn Geweissagte sie über jeden Anstoß an die ihr eröffnete Aussicht hinwegheben, wenn auch deren Möglichkeit ihr Denken übersteigt (Vers 34).

So stimmen also die beiden Evangelisten Matthäus und Lukas in Bezug auf die übernatürliche Herkunft des Kindes der Maria aufs bestimmteste überein. Diese ist das Zentrum der beiden Vorgeschichten und dafür als apostolische Verkündigung tritt das ganze kirchliche Altertum ein und es hat an Joh. 1, 11—14 und an Gal. 4, 4, also an noch zwei weiteren apostolischen Zeugnissen, eine unverkennbare und unanfechtbare Stütze. Der Tatbestand des Satzes des apostolischen Glaubensbekenntnisses: empfangen vom Heiligen

Geist, geboren von Maria der Jungfrau, steht deshalb völlig unabhängig von dem sonstigen Wert der Vorgeschichte, an und für sich fest. Es ist wahr, daß die Vorgeschichte im Matthäus- und Lukas-Evangelium von einander abweichen und es nicht leicht ist, die chronologische Abfolge der in beiden Evangelien berichteten Begebenheiten aufzuhellen. Die Gegner der Jungfraugeburt Jesu berufen sich hierauf. Aber die Glaubwürdigkeit der beiden Vorgeschichten darf darum doch nicht beanstandet werden. Die Geschichtsforschung stößt nicht selten auf differente und bei ihrem hohen Alter unausgleichbare Meldungen über Dinge, deren Tatsächlichkeit nichts destoweniger unanfechtbar ist. In unserm Fall aber reichen die Berichte einander ergänzend die Hand, schließen sich also nicht gegenseitig aus und bezüglich der Jungfraugeburt Jesu stimmen sie miteinander überein. Wer aber aus dogmatischen Gründen, weil er nicht glauben will oder kann, daß Jesus ist wahrhaftiger Gott und wahrhaftiger Mensch, die evangelischen Berichte verwirft, der hat bei der Harmonie so verschieden angelegter Vorgeschichten im Hauptpunkt keine Veranlassung, die wissenschaftliche Beweisbarkeit der berichteten Begebenheiten und insbesondere der übernatürlichen Geburt Jesu für unmöglich zu erklären.

Da nun Matthäus sich direkt und Lukas indirekt auf die Weissagung bei Jesaias 7, 14 beziehen, liegt es mir nun ob, dieselbe näher zu betrachten und zu erforschen, ob die hiergegen vorgebrachten Einwendungen stichhaltig sind oder nicht.

Jefferson (Seite 86—89) findet in der genannten Stelle bei Jesaias keine Beziehung auf Jesus und seine Mutter. Er schreibt, man habe angenommen, daß in dieser Stelle die Rede sei von der Jungfrau Maria und daß der Knabe, dessen Name Emmanuel heißt, Jesus sei. Aber das Studium der Bibel, das „wissenschaftliche" Studium meint er, habe ihn überzeugt, daß in jenem Verse überhaupt keine Beziehung auf Jesus oder seine Mutter liege. „Ich werde nie die Sensation vergessen," schreibt er, „die über mich kam, als mein Professor des Hebräischen, mir vor Jahren eine Erklärung hierüber gegeben hat. Es schien mir, als ob ein Teil der Erdrinde eingestürzt sei. Aber es ist kein Zweifel, daß diese Interpretation richtig ist." So Jefferson.

Nun, mein Professor des Hebräischen gab mir die Erklärung, daß in jener Stelle des Propheten offenbar und jeden Zweifel ausschließend von der Jungfrau Maria und ihrem Sohn Jesus die Rede sei, so daß dem Propheten von Gott hier in einer prophetischen Offenbarung die Geburt Jesu von Maria der Jungfrau enthüllt wurde. Seitdem habe ich gar manche Erklärung dieser Stelle gelesen und sorgfältig studiert, auch gegnerische und habe die Ueberzeugung gewonnen, daß die mir von meinem Professor gegebene

die richtige ist und daß alle Einwände der sogenannten höheren Bibelkritik sich als nicht stichhaltig erweisen. Dieser mein Lehrer war übrigens ein vorzüglicher Bibelkenner, ein in der Sprache des Alten Testaments wohl unterrichteter Mann, der mit rechter Akribie in seinen biblischen Forschungen zu Werk ging. Dies Lob muß ich ihm mit Dankbarkeit spenden, wenn ich auch in manchen andern Fragen jetzt nicht mit ihm übereinstimmen kann. In der vorliegenden Frage muß ich ihm zustimmen. Jefferson demonstriert so:

The Hebrew word translated "Virgin" was not properly translated. That word does not mean "virgin". In other parts of the Old Testament, where the word occurs, it is translated "maiden" or "damsel." When the Old Testament was translated into Greek, unfortunately a Greek word was chosen meaning "virgin", and that is the reason why the word "virgin" occurs in the Gospel according to St. Matthew. The Hebrew word means "marriageable woman," that is a woman that is old enough to be married, and there is no reference in the word to virginity. The prophet says that a marriageable woman shall conceive and bear a son, and that when the baby is born, his mother will call him Immanuel, which means "God is with us."

Wie verhält es sich nun mit dieser Beweisführung? Die Stelle Jes. 7, 14 lautet: Darum so wird auch der Herr selbst ein Zeichen geben: Siehe, die Jungfrau ist schwanger und wird einen Sohn gebären, den wird sie heißen Immanuel. Das ist genau der hebräische Text ins Deutsche übersetzt. Die Septuaginta (die Uebersetzung der Bücher des Alten Testaments in die griechische Sprache, begonnen um 280 v. Chr.) übersetzte die Stelle: Siehe, **die** Jungfrau wird im Leib haben und gebären einen Sohn usw. Der Ausdruck „siehe," der bestimmte Artikel (**die** Jungfrau) und die Partizipialadjektiven: „praegnans," „gravida" und „pariens" weisen, auch noch abgesehen von dem jedenfalls auffallenden Ausdruck „Jungfrau" deutlich darauf hin, daß dem Propheten ein großes, wunderbares Bild vor der **Seele** steht, auf welches er den König Ahas hinweist, als auf das Zeichen, das Jehova selbst geben werde.

Es geschah nämlich in den Tagen des Königs Ahas vom Reich Juda, so erzählt Jesaia im Anfang des siebenten Kapitels, daß die Könige von Syrien und Israel mit vereinten Streitkräften gegen Jerusalem zogen, um die Stadt zu erobern. Da erbebte das Herz des Ahas und das Herz seines Volkes, wie die Bäume des Waldes erbeben vor dem Angesicht des Sturmes. Da sprach der Herr zu Jesaia: Gehe hinaus Ahas entgegen, du und dein Sohn Sear-Jasub an das Ende der Wasserleitung des oberen Teiches an die Straße des Walkerfeldes und sage zu ihm: Siehe, daß du dich ruhig verhaltest (das ist Vertraue auf Gott!), fürchte dich nicht und dein Herz zage nicht vor diesen Enden rauchender Feuerbrände (das

heißt sie sind fertig, ihre Kraft ist nicht mehr für dich zu fürchten . . . .)

Und der Herr fuhr fort, zu Ahas zu reden und sprach: Fordere dir ein Zeichen von dem Herrn, deinem Gott, es sei in der Tiefe unten oder in der Höhe oben (das ist auf Erden oder am Himmel, so groß und unerhört, als du nur willst zur Bestätigung meiner Verheißung). Und Ahas sprach: Ich will keines begehren und den Herrn nicht versuchen. Da sprach Jesaia im Namen Gottes: Höret also, Haus Davids! Ist es euch zu wenig, die Menschen zu ermüden, daß ihr auch meinen Gott ermüdet (das heißt durch Verachtung der Worte der Propheten, die sich vergebens bei euch müde geredet. Soll nun auch Gott selbst, der unmittelbar durch ein großes Wunderzeichen zu euch reden will, von euch verschmäht werden?) **Darum** (weil du heuchlerisch kein Zeichen wählen willst, nur deiner menschlichen Politik ungehindert nachgehen willst), **darum** wird der Herr selbst euch ein Zeichen geben: Siehe, die Jungfrau wird empfangen usw.

Das ist der Zusammenhang, den man wohl beachten muß, um die Verheißung richtig zu erfassen. Das Wort Jungfrau ist die Uebersetzung des hebräischen Wortes Ha-Almah. Dieses Wort kommt noch an sechs Stellen der Bibel vor, nämlich 1. Mose 24, 43; 2. Mose 2, 8; Psalm 68, 26; Sprüche 30, 19; Hohe Lied 1, 3; 6, 8, und bedeutet überall dasselbe, was unser deutsches Wort „Jungfrau" bedeutet, doch mit dem Unterschied, daß es auch den Begriff des jugendlichen Alters mit dem des Standes der Jungfräulichkeit verbindet. An der einzigen sehr dunklen Stelle, Spr. 30, 19, bedeutet es wenigstens nicht das Gegenteil, in Hohe Lied 1, 3 und 6, 8 steht es sogar im Gegensatz zu den verheirateten Personen, Frauen und Nebenfrauen des Königs.

Almah, von dem Zeitwort „alam" abgeleitet, welches heißt verbergen und nur in dieser Bedeutung vorkommt, heißt die **Verborgene,** das ist die junge Person, die, sowie sie aus dem Kindesalter tritt, in der Wohnung ihrer Mutter verborgen gehalten wird, also nicht in der Oeffentlichkeit bei Festen usw. erscheinen darf bis zu ihrer Vermählung.

Es bedeutet also die heranreifende Jungfrau, „virgo nubilis," „marriageable woman." Wenn man aber meint, darin liege keine Beziehung zur Jungfräulichkeit, so verkennt man ganz und gar den Sprachgebrauch und die jüdische Sitte. Gerade die Jungfrauschaft ist darin ausgedrückt, wie Hieronymus, der berühmte Schriftausleger und Kenner der hebräischen Sprache, treffend bemerkt.

Non solum puella vel virgo sed cum epistasei virgo abscondita dicitur et secreta, quae nunquam parturit virorum aspectibus sed magna parentum diligentia custodita.

Und er bemerkt dazu, daß auch in der punischen Sprache Jungfrau im eigentlichen Sinn „almah" genannt werde.

Daß für den Begriff der Jungfräulichkeit ein eignes Wort vorhanden sei, nämlich Bethulah, schließt diese Bedeutung für Almah nicht aus, um so weniger, da jenes eine ähnliche Grundbedeutung hat wie dieses. Bathal, das Zeitwort, wovon das Substantiv Bethulah abgeleitet ist, heißt nämlich scheiden, absondern, also Bethulah die Abgesonderte wie Almah die Verborgene und zwar gerade zum Schutz ihrer Jungfräulichkeit und doch wird selbst Bethulah (Joel 1,8) von einer jungen Vermählten gebraucht. Für eine junge Person hat die hebräische Sprache drei Wörter: Naarah, griechisch νεανίς, lateinisch „puella," Mädchen, was mehr die Jugend; Bethulah, lateinisch „virgo," was mehr die Jungfräulichkeit hervorhebt und Almah was beide Begriffe, die Jugend und Jungfräulichkeit miteinander verbindet. Die Septuaginta gibt Almah gewöhnlich mit νεανίς, aber an unsrer Stelle: Jes. 7, 14 und 1. Mose 24, 43 (wo Abrahams Knecht, ausgesandt, für Isaak eine Frau zu suchen, betet: Wenn nur eine Jungfrau herauskommt an den Brunnen, Wasser zu schöpfen usw.) mit πάρθενος; die Vulgata an diesen beiden Stellen mit „virgo," sonst mit „puella," „juvencula," „adulescentula"; die syrische Uebersetzung, Peschito = die Getreue genannt, hört an unsrer Stelle Bethulah, das Targum des Joanathan Ulemthah; die arabische Uebersetzung sowie Matth. 1, 23 und Lukas 1, 31 haben „virgo." Diese alle halten an dem Begriff der Jungfrauschaft fest. Und was der Glaube der Judenschaft bezüglich der Herkunft des Christus, des Messias war, zeigt die Stelle bei Johannes 7, 25—27. Daß der wieder zum Judentum abgefallene Aquilas, die Ebioniten Theodotion und Symmachus und einige Rabbiner νεανίς, vorziehen, bringt ihr Standpunkt mit sich. Es ist auch sehr bezeichnend, daß im ganzen christlichen Altertum nur die sogenannten Doketen, welche lehrten, Christus habe nur einen Scheinleib gehabt und die Ebioniten, welche in Christus nur einen Menschen erkannten, die Geburt Jesu von der Jungfrau verwarfen. Die Sozinianer in der Neuzeit lehrten ebenfalls, daß Jesus bloßer Mensch sei, aber übernatürlich erzeugt.

Aus diesen Ausführungen geht klar hervor, daß die Stelle Jes. 7, 14 messianisch und daß der Erlöser von einer Jungfrau geboren wurde. Nun weisen die Gegner noch auf die folgenden Worte der Prophetie hin: „Milch und Honig wird er essen, bis er weiß, das Böse zu verwerfen und das Gute zu wählen. Denn ehe der Knabe verstehen wird, zu verwerfen das Böse und zu wählen das Gute, wird verödet sein das Land, vor dessen zwei Königen dir graut." Man sagt: Wenn der Prophet an Jesus von Nazareth hierbei gedacht hätte, so wäre er in großem Irrtum befangen ge-

wesen, denn Jesus von Nazareth wurde erst 700 Jahre, nachdem Jesaia diese Worte gesprochen, geboren und wie konnte er da ein Zeichen für Ahas sein?

Wenn dazu Jefferson bemerkt: Der Prophet sagte: Gott wird dir ein Zeichen geben und er wird es dir sehr bald geben, so legt er dem Propheten etwas in den Mund, was nicht in der betreffenden Stelle steht. Der Prophet sagte nur: Darum wird euch der Herr selbst ein Zeichen geben und daß er dies sehr bald geben werde, hat Jefferson sich hinzugedacht. Wir dürfen nicht vergessen, daß der heuchlerische Ahas ein Zeichen vom Herrn, „es sei in der Tiefe unten oder in der Höhe oben" verschmäht hatte, und daß darum der Prophet in Gottes Auftrag feierlich erklärte: „Darum wird der Herr selbst euch ein Zeichen geben."

Und dieses Zeichen ist eben der Sohn der Jungfrau, dessen Name Immanuel sein soll; Immanuel, das ist Gott mit uns. Darin liegt ausgedrückt: Das wird er auch für euch sein; denn so gewiß die Jungfrau, die Mutter des Messias, durch ein ganz unerhörtes Wunder empfangen und gebären wird, und ihr Kind im vollkommensten Sinn „Gott mit uns," das heißt der menschgewordene Gott und Erlöser der Menschheit ist, so gewiß wird um seinetwillen der Anschlag der Feinde gegen das Haus Davids vereitelt werden. Dies wird in **kürzerer Frist** geschehen, als einst das Kind der Jungfrau, der Immanuel, zu den Unterscheidungsjahren kommen wird. **Für dich** und dein Haus aber hat dies große Zeichen wegen eures Unglaubens nichts Tröstliches. Denn nur vor dem Untergang wird Davids Haus bewahrt bleiben. Dein Mangel an Gottvertrauen aber und dein Hilfesuchen bei Assyrien wird auch über dein Land das Verderben herbeiziehen und es gleichfalls der Verödung preisgeben. Dieses Verderben wird dann vom Propheten in den Versen 17—25 näher beschrieben.

Und buchstäblich ging in dieser Weise die Prophezeiung in Erfüllung.

Wer die Jungfrau und ihr Kind ist, darüber sind, wie wir gesehen, die Evangelisten und die ganze christliche Ueberlieferung einstimmig. In dem Augenblick, da Menschen die Verheißung Gottes umstürzen wollen, erinnert der Prophet den Ahas an die seinem Ahnen David gewordene messianische Verheißung (2. Samuel 7, 12—16), die dem Ahas, wenn er gläubig war, zum festesten Grund seines Gottvertrauens gereichen mußte. Die **Jungfrau,** die Gott dem Propheten vor sein geistiges Auge führt samt ihrem wunderbaren Kind, ist dieselbe, die dem Ahas wahrscheinlich durch den Propheten Micha (5, 1) in Erinnerung gebracht war, die in Bethlehem Ephrata den gebären soll, der in Israel Herr sein wird, welches Ausgang von Anfang und von Ewigkeit her gewesen ist,

bis zu dessen wunderbaren Geburt der Herr sein Volk preisgeben will (Micha 5, 2. 3). Es ist das Weib, auf das beim Untergang des Volkes Jeremia als auf den Stern der Hoffnung hinweist mit den Worten: „Der Herr wird ein Neues (unerhörtes Wunder) im Land erschaffen: Das Weib wird einen Mann umschließen," und mit ihm wird der Segen der Gerechtigkeit und Heiligkeit kommen! Es ist die jungfräuliche Mutter des Erlösers, deren Jungfrauschaft und jungfräuliche Mutterschaft schon dadurch genügend im Alten Bund bezeugt wird, daß nie von einem menschlichen Vater des Messias die Rede ist.

Eine solche Hinweisung paßte auch ganz zur Größe des Augenblicks; auf ein solches Wunderzeichen hinzudeuten nach Verschmähung der Wahl eines Zeichens „in der Tiefe unten oder in der Höhe oben," war Gottes würdig; eine solche Prüfung des Glaubens des Ahas war die passendste Antwort auf seine Heuchelei; auch konnte eine solche Erinnerung es erklärlich machen, wie Gott sogar einem Ahas helfe, und zwar zugleich in den nun hereinbrechenden Strafgerichten der leuchtende Hoffnungsstern für alle Guten.

Ueberdies ergibt sich die **Notwendigkeit** dieser messianischen Auffassung auch aus dem Zusammenhang mit dem folgenden. Weil Ahas in seinem Unglauben menschliche Hilfe sucht, so wird sein Helfer ihm zur Geißel, seinem Volk zum Verderben. Der König von Assyrien wird zwar die feindlichen Könige überwältigen, aber dann selbst ein viel mächtigerer und gefährlicherer Feind für Juda werden und es dem Untergang preisgeben. — **Nur ein Trost,** nur eine Hoffnung leuchtet dem Propheten in diese Nacht des Unglücks hinein: Es ist das Kind der Jungfrau. **Sein** Land ist es, das die Assyrer verwüsten. Aber die Anschläge der Feinde Israels müssen zu Schanden werden. Kapitel 8.

So stimmt denn das Alte Testament mit dem Neuen darin vollkommen überein, daß der Messias, Jesus Christus, ist geboren von der Jungfrau Maria. Und wie Gott dem Propheten Jesaia das ganze Leben und Leiden, den Tod und die Verherrlichung seines einigen Sohnes geoffenbart hat, so daß er den Namen des Evangelisten unter den Propheten erhielt, so hat er ihm auch seine übernatürliche Empängnis und wunderbare Geburt enthüllt.

Wenn Jefferson und andre meinen, daß weder im Evangelium Markus noch in dem des Johannes, weder in der Apostelgeschichte noch in den Briefen der Apostel die Jungfraugeburt vorkomme, so ist das insofern richtig, daß dieselbe nicht ausdrücklich genannt wird. Aber wäre das auch notwendig? Genügt es nicht, daß zwei der Evangelien übereinstimmend dieselbe berichten? Und sind denn alle Begebenheiten, welche Matthäus und Lukas erzählen, auch im

Evangelium des Markus und Johannes berichtet? Und doch zweifelt man sie deswegen nicht an. Uebrigens, und das ist doch von ausschlaggebender Bedeutung, hat Markus sein Evangelium charakterisiert als das „Evangelium von Jesu Christo, **dem Sohn Gottes.**" Sodann berichtet Markus die Stimme vom Himmel bei der Taufe Jesu: „Du bist mein lieber Sohn, an dem ich Wohlgefallen habe." Sogar die unreinen Geister, die Jesus in göttlicher Allmacht gezwungen hat, ihre unglücklichen Opfer zu verlassen, bekennen laut in Gegenwart vor vielen Zeugen, daß Er ist der Heilige Gottes, der Sohn Gottes und alle wußten, daß Er der Sohn Marias war, welche unter ihnen lebte, die sie alle kannten (zum Beispiel Markus 1, 21 ff.). Und erst Johannes, der in dem sogenannten Prolog zu seinem Evangelium Jesum nennt das ewige Wort, das im Anfang bei Gott war und Gott war und dann schreibt: „Und das Wort ward Fleisch und wohnte unter uns und wir sahen seine Herrlichkeit, eine Herrlichkeit als des eingeborenen Sohnes vom Vater, voller Gnade und Wahrheit." Und derselbe Johanes schrieb sein Evangelium, „auf daß ihr glaubet, Jesus sei der Christ, der Sohn Gottes, und daß ihr durch den Glauben das Leben habet in seinem Namen" (Joh. 20, 31). Dasselbe bezeugt er in seinen Briefen wiederholt (zum Beispiel 1. Joh. 1, 7; 5, 1, 11, 12, 20). In der Apostelgeschichte wird an vielen Stellen erzählt, daß die Apostel Jesum predigten als den wahrhaftigen Sohn Gottes, der zu unsrer Erlösung am Kreuz gestorben, aber von den Toten auferstanden ist. Sie hatten nicht notwendig die Geburt Jesu von der Jungfrau ausdrücklich zu erwähnen. Wenn aber Paulus nicht überzeugt gewesen wäre von der Geburt seines Heilandes von der Jungfrau, wie könnten wir dann die Stelle in seinem Brief an die Philipper (2. Kapitel) erklären: „Ein jeglicher sei gesinnt, wie Jesus Christus auch war, welcher, ob er wohl in göttlicher Gestalt war, hielt er's nicht für einen Raub, Gott gleich sein, sondern entäußerte sich selbst, nahm Knechtsgestalt an, ward gleich wie ein andrer Mensch und an Gebärden als ein Mensch erfunden." Ja, man darf kühn behaupten, daß Johannes und Paulus so sehr von dieser großen, grundlegenden und lebenspendenden Wahrheit von der Gottheit Jesu Christi durchdrungen waren, daß man leichter aus ihren Schriften schließen könnte: Er wäre vielleicht überhaupt nicht wahrer Mensch gewesen, da er wahrhaftiger Gott war. Aber beides steht ihnen felsenfest. Er war wahrhaftiger Gott und wahrhaftiger Mensch.

War Jesus Christus aber wahrhaftig der Sohn Gottes, so entstammte er nicht einem menschlichen Vater; dann kann er nur sein empfangen vom Heiligen Geist, geboren von der Jungfrau Maria. Ein andrer Schluß ist logisch unmöglich.

Nun aber suchen sich die Gegner der Jungfraugeburt zu helfen und Jefferson ist nur einer derselben, sprechend in ihrem Namen. Diese berufen sich darauf, daß Lukas schreibt, Joseph wurde für den Vater Jesu gehalten („was supposed to be His father"); ferner werde in den Evangelien mehr als einmal Joseph der Vater Jesu genannt. So schreibe Lukas: „Seine Eltern brachten Jesus in den Tempel," ferner: „Seine Eltern brachten ihn nach Jerusalem," ferner: Sogar Maria habe gesagt: „Siehe, dein Vater und ich haben dich mit Schmerzen gesucht." Wie erklärt man sich dies. Ihr Wortführer ist naiv genug zu schreiben (Seite 93): Es scheine ihm, als ob es zwei Ueberlieferungen („traditions") in früheren Jahren in Palästina gegeben habe: Nach der einen wäre Joseph als Vater Jesu gehalten worden und nach der andern wäre Gott als sein Vater geglaubt worden. Diese beiden Ueberlieferungen seien in unser Neues Testament aufgenommen worden, so daß, wenn jemand an die Jungfraugeburt glaubt, er dann in der Schrift einen Beweis für seinen Glauben finden kann; und wenn jemand nicht an die Jungfraugeburt glaubt, dann auch für sein Nichtglauben einen Beweis darin findet. Er schließt:

These are the facts, then, which have been making their impression on the men of our day.

Hierauf will ich nur ganz kurz erwidern: Es war die allsorgende Weisheit Gottes, daß sie der jungfräulichen Mutter des Erlösers in Joseph einen würdigen, unbescholtenen Beschützer gab, auf daß sie in den Augen der Menschen, welche von dem in ihr vollzogenen Geheimnis keine Kenntnis hatten, nicht als ehrlos dastehen sollte. Und auch Jesus sollte in Joseph einen väterlichen Schutz, einen für seinen Unterhalt sorgenden Vater, einen Pflegevater, haben, so lange bis das Geheimnis der Menschwerdung in dem Schooß der Jungfrau nach dem Ratschluß Gottes offenbart werden sollte. Dies Amt war Joseph von Gott durch den Engel übertragen worden und er führte es getreu aus, war der besorgte Gemahl Marias und für Jesus ein guter Vater. Wie aber ein gutes, wohlerzogenes Kind seinen zweiten Vater einfach Vater nennt, obschon derselbe es nicht ist, und ihm willig den schuldigen Gehorsam leistet, so nannte Jesus den Joseph seinen Vater und war ihm wie seiner Mutter untertan. Gott war ihm aber sein himmlischer Vater.

So erweist sich denn alles, was man bisher gegen die Jungfraugeburt Jesu vorgebracht hat, als hinfällig. Kein einziger Grund, den Theologen oder Laien gegen sie ins Feld führten, sei es von geschichtlichem oder naturgeschichtlichem oder bibelkritischem Standpunkt aus, noch all die Gründe zusammengenommen, vermögen den Glauben an sie zu erschüttern. Wer aber in Jesus nur

einen Menschen, einen Menschen mit göttlicher Kraft ausgerüstet, den edelsten, besten vollkommensten Menschen und wie sonst noch die gebrauchten Ausdrücke lauten, erkennt, der steht, wer er immer sein mag, nicht auf dem Boden der Bibel, auch nicht auf dem Boden des christlichen Glaubens.

Um noch einmal zu dem oft erwähnten Pastor, Schriftsteller und Doktor der heiligen Theologie zurückzukommen, er konstatiert am Schluß seiner Abhandlung als seinen eignen Standpunkt, daß die Jungfraugeburt nicht verworfen werden muß wegen irgendetwas, was die Wissenschaft ausgefunden hat. „If you deny it, you have no solid ground on which to stand," bemerkt er. Auch muß die Jungfraugeburt nicht verworfen werden wegen irgend etwas, was die Geschichtsforschung entdeckt hat.

Aber er glaubt, daß der Glaube an die Jungfraugeburt nicht wesentlich ist zur Erlösung; auch nicht wesentlich, ein Jünger Jesu zu sein, und auch nicht wesentlich, ein Glied einer christlichen Kirche zu sein; endlich ist dieser Glaube auch nicht wesentlich zum Glauben an die Menschwerdung. Dies letztere ist wohl das merkwürdigste Moment in seinen Festsetzungen. Er beruft sich hierbei auf das Urteil eines Dr. Charles Gore, nach seinem Urteil des größten lebenden Theologen in der englisch sprechenden Welt, und erklärt: Wenn die ersten Christen an die Fleischwerdung glaubten, aber nichts von der Jungfraugeburt wußten, dann können sicher die Christen des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts an die Fleischwerdung glauben, obwohl sie nichts von der Art und Weise von Jesu Geburt wissen.

So kommt Jefferson zu dem Bekenntnis, daß er auch an die Jungfraugeburt Jesu glaubt, aber nicht, weil Matthäus und Lukas dieselbe lehren; er basiert seinen Glauben daran, daß Jesus ist „the Holiest of the Mighty," wie auch Paulus seinen Glauben an die Gottheit Jesu auf Christi Heiligkeit und Macht gegründet habe.

Probleme der Religionspsychologie.*

Eine Erwiderung von Frl. L. Kugler, Danzig.

Ich zweifle nicht daran, daß die Religionspsychologie durchaus etwas Gutes ist, daß es ihr ernst ist um das Forschen nach Wahrheit. Durch exakte wissenschaftliche Arbeit, durch Experimentieren, genaues Beobachten mag sie zu Resultaten gelangen, die nicht allein interessant und brauchbar, sondern sogar von hohem praktischen Wert sein können. Sie mag auch der Theologie nicht zu unterschätzende Dienste leisten, besonders in pädagogischer Hinsicht, in Religionsunterricht und Seelsorge. Man läßt sich jedoch durch Erfolge so leicht blenden und wird verführt, von einer Sache mehr zu erwarten und mehr in sie hineinzulegen, als sie zu leisten vermag. Man sollte doch nicht vergessen: **die moderne Psychologie ist eine Naturwissenschaft** und hat als solche ihre Grenzen, über die sie nicht hinaus kann. Bei allen Naturwissenschaften gelangt man notwendig bis zu einem Punkt, wo sie versagen müssen. Hier ist ihr Feld zu Ende, hier tritt die Metaphysik in ihre Rechte, zu welcher ihnen der Schlüssel fehlt. Zu gern verlegt man sich dann aber aufs Vermuten und Raten und glaubt, damit sei der Sache ebenso gedient. Man wirft mit Wörtern und Begriffen um sich, unter denen sich wohl kaum irgendwer etwas Bestimmtes denken kann, wie zum Beispiel Urmaterie, Urenergie, Lebenskraft, Vitalismus usw. Dieser Unfug zieht mit Recht den Unwillen ernstdenkender Menschen auf sich.

Die Religionspsychologie freilich hat diese ihre Grenzen wohl erkannt, denn in ihrem Programm sagt sie, „sie wolle nur das Zustandekommen religiöser Vorstellungen, Gedankenverbindungen und Gefühle untersuchen und beschreiben. Ueber Wahrheit, Wert und Berechtigung der Religion vermöge sie nichts zu sagen.“ — Sie hat recht damit, denn das sind **metaphysische Fragen,** die garnicht in ihr Gebiet fallen. Wenn aber nun doch Anhänger dieser Richtung solche Fragen anschneiden, so ist das ein Mißgriff, den man nicht billigen kann, wenn man ihn auch versteht. Es ist klar, daß die Religionspsychologie die angesehene Stellung, die sie einmal errungen hat, nicht wieder verlieren möchte und bestrebt ist, sich womöglich noch mehr in den Vordergrund zu rücken.

Wenn aber die Theologie mit gläubigem Gemüt den Offenbarungen entgegensieht, die jene ihr verheißt, so beruht das, meiner Meinung nach, auf Unkenntnis der Sachlage; darauf nämlich, daß man nach wie vor die Psychologie als zur Metaphysik gehörig ansieht. Man kann eben nicht immer so schnell umlernen! In die-

*) Siehe „Theol. Magazin“ Nr. 3, 1923. Diese „Erwiderung“ ist durch Umstände stark verzögert worden. Ed.

sem Fall aber müßte man ihr ja dann auch die Berechtigung zur Teilnahme bei der Erörterung religiöser Fragen zuerkennen. Andernfalls wäre es allerdings nicht recht erklärlich, wie die Theologie sich einer Naturwissenschaft zuwendet und sie als Stützpunkt für ihr Gebäude verwerten möchte. Ich denke, die Naturwissenschaften waren bisher in der Theologie als empirisch und materialistisch verpönt.

Es scheint mir auch nicht richtig, daß die Religionspsychologen das Hauptmoment bei der Religion **im Gefühl** suchen. Religiöse Schwärmerei ist nicht Religion. Ich will damit nicht etwa der Vernunft das Wort reden. Diese hat ebensowenig wie das Gefühl etwas mit Religion zu tun: Religion ist keine abstrakte Gedankentätigkeit, auch nicht, wenn es sich um das Bilden religiöser Vorstellungen handelt. Das ist Sache der Religionsphilosophie. Die Vernunft als solche ist unfruchtbar und irrt umher und bleibt stets unbefriedigt. Religion dagegen wirkt gestaltend, bildend, von innen aus sich selber heraus. Sie verleiht zwar innere Befriedigung und Glück. Es kann einer aber die ganze Theologie, Religionsphilosophie und auch Ethik im Kopf haben und ist doch nicht religiös zu nennen. Denn nicht derjenige hat Religion, der seinen Standpunkt außerhalb der Welt nimmt und objektiv über Gott, Welt und Moral urteilt, sondern allein, wer mitten im Leben steht und sich selbst behauptet der Welt gegenüber. Nur Religion befähigt uns, recht mit dem Leben zu ringen; sie entscheidet für unsre **praktische Stellungnahme dem Leben gegenüber.**

Trifft diese Erklärungsweise nicht besonders auch auf das Christentum zu? Ich meine die reine wahre Lehre Jesu, wie sie besonders auch in den Synoptikern zum Ausdruck kommt und im Gegensatz steht zu den Verdrehungen, die sich später die Kirche, die alleinseligmachende, leistete; abgesehen auch von allem jüdisch-materialistischen Beiwerk, welches das Christentum mit sich herumschleppt — der ewige Jude in uns.

Die **Lehre Jesu** ist darum so selbstverständlich, schlicht und klar, weil sie durchaus **auf das Praktische gerichtet** ist. Da ist nichts von trockener, fruchtloser Gedankenspekulation, nichts von religiöser Schwärmerei und Gefühlsseligkeiten. Er sagt: Folge mir, verleugne dich selbst, liebe Freund und Feind; tue dies, vermeide jenes — so wirst du leben! — Der schlichteste Mann aus dem Volk versteht das alles ebenso wie der Gelehrte. Vielleicht versteht er es sogar besser als jener, weil er dem praktischen Leben noch näher steht, weil noch keine Vernünfteleien seinen Verstand trüben. Darum sagt auch Christus: Selig sind die geistlich Armen! — Menschen die schlichten Geistes sind.

Es ist deshalb auch gleichgültig für die Religion, ob die Philo-

sophie das Dasein Gottes zu beweisen oder es zu widerlegen sich vergeblich abmüht; ob Philosophie und hier auch Religionspsychologie über Berechtigung, Wert und Wahrheit der Religion streiten, ob sie heute mit Ja, morgen mit Nein entscheiden — was kann das der Religion schaden!

O, über die ängstlichen Gemüter, die da meinen, Sein oder Nichtsein hänge von solch fruchtlosem Schulstreit ab! Die Religion ist auf festerem Fundament gebaut. Dieser gewaltige, ehrwürdige Dom stürzt nicht gleich zusammen, wenn Mäuse an den Türen, vielleicht auch gar an den Altären nagen. Wenn aber das Dogmengebäude dieses oder jenes Theologen zusammenstürzt, so beweist das nur, daß es auf Sand gebaut war und darum dem Sturm der Zeiten nicht standhalten konnte: Mag es fallen — was schadet es der Religion. Solcher Stützen, solcher schwachen Geister kann sie wohl entbehren. „O, ihr Kleingläubigen," würde ihnen Jesus zurufen, „warum seid ihr so furchtsam!"

Die Religion wurzelt fester, sie wurzelt tief im Menschenherzen. Es kommen wohl für jeden Menschen Augenblicke im Leben, wo er sich über die Nichtigkeit des Daseins erheben möchte, wo er um Mut und Kraft ringt, den bitteren Kelch des Lebens und Leidens zu trinken. Dann sucht und findet er Erhebung und Stärkung im Gebet. So betet der evangelische Christ zum Vater in Christo, das katholische Mütterchen zu Maria, das indische zu Buddha. Sie alle hoffen auf Erhörung, selbst der Wilde, der vor seinem Steingötzen kniet. Der Götze freilich hilft ihm nicht; alle aber mögen Stärkung und Trost im Gebet finden, wenn auch verschieden nach Art und Maß. Doch wer erklärt uns den geheimnisvollen Vorgang, durch den dem Beter, wie aus dem eigenen erquickten Innern jene neue Kraft zuströmt? Und ob wir jenes auch schon selbst erlebten, suchen wir doch immer wieder etwas außer uns, was die Ursache sein möchte von dem, was uns innerlich widerfährt und bewegt — ja, was nur durch eine allgegenwärtige Macht vermittelt sein kann. Wir aber möchten es irgendwo in die Welt da draußen hin verlegen, damit wir es wahrnehmen können mit unserm Verstand und unsern Sinnen; sinnlich, bildlich meinen wir es uns erst machen zu müssen. So unvollkommen ist unser menschliches Erkenntnisvermögen, daß wir es garnicht anders zu fassen vermögen.

Auch unsre Sprache vermag dies alles nicht so recht klar auszudrücken, wenn nicht unsre Sprachweise es noch gar verdunkelt. So reden wir **von Gott**, grammatisch, **in der dritten Person**; als ob er nicht allzeit zugegen wäre und wir uns von ihm, wie von einem abwesenden, ungezwungen unterhalten könnten. Müßte er nicht mindestens stets in der zweiten Person stehen, wie wir sein

Ebenbild in jedem Nächsten zu entdecken haben; ja, müßte er nicht eigentlich die erste, **die allererste** sein?

Doch erinnern wir uns, wie Christus vor seinen Jüngern immer wieder mißverstanden wird. Als er zu ihnen vom Vater sprach, sagen sie: „Herr, zeige uns den Vater," und Jesus erwidert: „Ich und der Vater sind eins." Er weiß, daß sie ihn auch jetzt nicht verstehen. Freilich lernten sie sein späteres Wort schon durch den feindlichen Gegensatz etwas verstehen, nämlich jenes erhabene: „Mein Reich ist nicht von dieser Welt."

Es ist also nicht die Welt da draußen, die wir mit unsern Sinnen wahrnehmen, die Welt der Erscheinung, nach Kant, die Welt der Vorstellung, der Objekte, nach Schopenhauer, die Welt des Truges, der Schleier der Maja (indisch) — die empirisch reale Welt.

„Siehe, das Reich Gottes ist inwendig in euch," sagt unser Erlöser. „In deinem Innern ist ein Universum auch," viel wirklicher als alle Wirklichkeit, die uns Sinne und Verstand geben, die so leicht trügen, **ein Reich, uns unmittelbar bewußt.** Trotz ihrer schlichten und praktisch klaren Weise steht also Jesu Lehre doch in direktem Gegensatz zu allem, noch so poetischen, aber kraß sinnlichen Realismus. Ein Byron zum Beispiel, sensualistisch und pantheistisch gebannt, fällt aus seiner Festung, wenn er fragt:

Are not the mountains, waves and skies a part Of me and of my soul, as I of them?

Demnach trägt der Genannte in poetischem Schwung von der eigenen Seele und ihrem ewigen Reich das Gleichnis hinaus in das All und erkennt sich selbst wieder, nicht etwa im lieben Nächsten, sondern in der Außen- und Sinnenwelt der freien Natur.

Während nun **Christi Lehre durchaus idealistisch** ist, finden wir das Christentum unsrer Tage derart von jüdischem Materialismus durchsetzt und entstellt, daß man seinen Ursprung kaum mehr erkennt und fast versucht ist, es als eine jüdische, verweltlichte Sekte anzusprechen. Wie selten sind diejenigen, die dem Sohn Gottes die Ehre geben, die ihm unbedingt gebührt, die nämlich seine Worte für buchstäbliche ewige Wahrheit eben durch dementsprechendes Befolgen anerkennen? Das halbgläubige und ungläubige Modechristentum von heute ist es, das die tiefer Denkenden von der Lehre Christi abschreckt und verscheucht.

Das Verhalten und Leben dieser Namenschristen ist es, was doch den wenigen aufrichtigen gegenüber, den Außenstehenden viel lauter gepredigt und **Jesu Lehre** in ihren Augen gar verächtlich erscheinen läßt; seine Lehre, die doch in Wahrheit **das Tiefste und Erhabenste** ist, was je Menschengeist bewegt hat, bewegt eben dazu, im Glauben mit Jesu Person in ewige Verbindung zu treten.

Christus lehrte den **unendlichen Wert der Menschenseele,** einen Wert, der über alle Maße geschaffener Werte hinausgeht. Von dieser Seele sagt er: „Was hülfe es dem Menschen, so er die ganze Welt gewönne und nähme doch Schaden an seiner Seele, oder was kann der Mensch geben, damit er seine Seele wieder löse?“ Wenn er also sagt, „das Reich Gottes ist in euch,“ so meint er doch zweifellos, in ihr, in der Seele. Ist sie aber **Trägerin des Reiches Gottes,** so ist sie doch vor allem auch Subjekt und Objekt der Religion. Welchen Wert auch solche derselben zumessen, die man schwerlich tief religiös nennen dürfte, beweist ein Ausspruch Goethes, den wir hier noch zum Schluß anführen. Er sagt: Die Religion ist ein Gefühl der Sicherheit und des Vertrauens auf ein unerforschliches Wesen in uns.

EDITORIALS

OUR APPROACH TO RELIGION SHOULD IT BE THEOLOGICAL OR PSYCHOLOGICAL?

Recently we had the unusual privilege to hear *H. E. Fosdick,* the pastor of Park Avenue Baptist Church, of New York City. He delivered a sermon at the ordination of a young man who had been his assistant in pastoral work and his pupil (at Union Theol. Seminary) for two years. The mere announcement of his coming worked wonders. Admission was by ticket, and over 2,000 tickets were given out, so it was said.

The speaker set out by saying there was quite a good deal of disturbance about religion in the land; many felt that religion had to be saved. It was somewhat like a great reservoir of water that had at one time been a source of refreshment and life to many, but now it had become leaky and might burst at any time: it had changed to a source of anxiety. In his opinion the excitement was entirely unnecessary. *Instead of saving religion,* it was much more important to *get a religion that saves us.* The first thing such a religion would do would be a liberating process: Instead of the gratification of the lower self it would offer a man a higher cause to give himself to.

He told us, young students often come to him confessing that they have lost their religion. He soon convinces them that the case is not so bad at all. They still have ideals they want to pursue; causes they want to affiliate themselves with. Why, he says to them, you have not lost your religion; you are in the service of the ideal. Don't you see that that is the same as being religious? Here he related the story of a doctor who had gone to Africa to combat the yellow fever, but on arriving there he found that the serum that elsewhere had been successful failed there. So he tried to find a better one, making experiments on his own blood. He contracted the fever himself, died a victim of his love of suffering humanity and was buried in New York the week before. Was not the self-sacrifice of this heroic man the very highest manifestation of the religious spirit?

So, he concluded, was the student's quest of ideals religious in itself and needed only stimulation to flower out in perfect form. We did not quite agree with the eloquent speaker. We certainly also admired that doctor, but we had heard of people trying to find the Northpole and enduring untold miseries in the attempt; we had

heard of others who lost their lives in crossing the Atlantic, getting the praises of mankind for their daring in the service of flying art; of millions of soldiers who had brought the supreme sacrifice on the altar of patriotism. All these men had ideals and thought their lives cheap. They made our hearts beat higher, but we don't see what religion had to do with it. To us religion relates man to God; and not only here but throughout the whole discourse we did not see *how* and *where God came in.*

Doubtless F. was trying the psychological approach. His way is to take men as they are and to build on the mental attitudes and inner experiences of his subjects. He does not want to impose any kind of "theology" on them: the miracles, or the divine nature of Christ, or the atonement, or the fall of Adam. But he never told us how he bridges the gulf from the mere ideal to the living God. He did not even mention the name of Jesus Christ. He said himself that he had left Jesus out on purpose; that he had intentionally spoken only in modern terms. Imagine, at an ordination service of a Christian minister! No wonder he never succeeded in bringing God in; that he never mentioned sin or salvation.

The second characteristic of a religion that saves us was its power to lay hold on us. A weak, an intermittant, a traditional, a lukewarm religion can do but little. Only the men in whom it is an absorbing passion will experience its full power. True enough, but how do we reach that point or come approximately nearer to it?

The last attribute of a saving religion is its ever present influence in the daily life. This feature was admirably described. Religion must show its pragmatic value in the school of life. Christian Science and New Thought have an incredible metaphysics but they teach their disciples to draw on the present power of the divine spirit; they get results. The churches of the old kind have neglected this and so other cults have pushed ahead of them. We must learn a lesson from them. God is here, his presence is available for us. Serenity, poise of soul, integration of personality can be won here. In this connection F. made the strange statement, "Less and less do I want God as a matter of faith, but more and more do I need and want him as a matter of fact." As though we could get assured of the reality of God in any other way than by the way of faith!

It will be admitted that the features which F. mentioned are indeed vital to a live religion, but he promised to tell us *how we get* that kind of religion—and he did not keep his promise. To our mind, he should have led those students from their personal and circumscribed ideals to the universal and all-embracing one, the Kingdom of God. Then he would have to bring in Jesus Christ,

the highest source of inspiration and the unmatched example of ethical and spiritual striving, and, at the same time, the guarantee of the ultimate victory of the true idealist. Going still further, he would have had to show that the Christian religion is par excellence a *redeemer-religion,* that Christ is not only an inspiring example but a redeemer, a saviour. No doubt that would have brought in "theological" elements, but it is utterly impossible to omit such. The very nature of the psychological approach would demand it, for the subjects of our pastoral care have grown up in the Christian faith or, at least, under its influence. The study of natural science may have put stumbling blocks in their way, but still they know science can't take the place of religion; they know the Christian religion is there and that there is no other religion in sight that could take its place. All this belongs to their intellectual and moral equipment; so we have to start from it and try to clear a way for the real Christ.

F. used a striking illustration to show the different kinds of approach by men of different schools. He put it as follows: A man is stalled with his automobile on the highway, he has no gas. Along comes the fundamentalist and tells him: "A mile from here is a filling station where you can replenish your tank: believe it and you will be saved." An old-fashioned Liberal comes along, views the situation and says: "I think there is a filling station not far from here, at least it is very likely. Act *as though* there was one and you will be saved."

Finally comes the modern man. He goes into the car examines it carefully, finds it is not empty at all and says: There is quite a good bit of gas left; go ahead on your own power and soon you'll find a station where you can get a new supply."

F. is this modern teacher. He finds in man enough of goodness and idealism to be hopeful about him. All he needs is to have his ethics strengthened and his mind informed. How this is to be done he did not tell us.

We, on the other hand, believe that there is little hope for a man before he has a sense of moral and spiritual need, is looking for divine help. We are sure this help comes to him only through Christ, the Saviour. We also use the psychological approach, we start from a man's individual experience. From there, however, we make as brief and direct a road to Christ as possible; and we still believe that the message of the crucified and risen Christ that started the church on its world-conquering career, is the source of its ever renewed life, and not the ethical teachings of the Sermon on the Mount.

CORPORATE COMMUNIONS

In this year's "Reports" to the District Conferences the Brotherhood had a recommendation that "Retreats" for men should be introduced, i. e., gatherings of Brotherhood men, held, preferably, far from the noise of the cities, at which "devotional subjects, such as prayer, worship, meditation, bible study, closer fellowship with God, the power of the Holy Spirit, soul-winning might be treated and intercession practised. The celebration of the Lord's Supper should be a part of such retreats." This latter clause about the Lord's Supper provoked a good deal of discussion at our Conference (Ohio). It was pointed out that the celebration of the Lord's Supper by the Brotherhood men only had a tendency to counteract one of the very purposes for which the Sacrament was instituted. The Lord's Supper stresses the fact that the church of Christ is one ("one body, with many members"). Now if we celebrate communion by one organization only, we introduce a divisive element. Pretty soon the women would want a communion for themselves; then the Young People's League, the Missionary Society, etc. Such observances, instead of uniting the church, would split it up into separate units. Instead of unification, segregation and disruption would be the consequence. In reply to this, others stated that it was not the idea at all that from such communions for particular organizations the rest of the congregation should be excluded. They might all come, every one was welcome; only, a more especial appeal was to be made to the members of that specific body. It seemed that most speakers were satisfied with that explanation. No one objected to corporate communion as such, so long as they were open to everybody else.

This writer takes a different position. He has never announced a communion for a separate organization. He has never invited the Brotherhood or the Ladies' Aid to come to the Lord's table in a body—and he never expects to. We may invite—and do invite—whole organizations to the church services; we may go out into the by-ways and lanes of the city with a general invitation, and even urge them to come in. Not so with the Lord's Supper. Here only those are invited who are penitent, who have faith in Christ and truly desire to lead a Christian life. A person may belong to a Brotherhood or Ladies' Aid and yet wholly lack these qualifications. If I invite them to come to the Lord's table because they are members of a certain body they come for that reason and the spiritual requirements are apt to be lost sight of.

It may be objected that we extend a general invitation to the Lord's Supper at Easter time, and that among the communicants there will be many who are not really prepared, and come only

because it's Easter. That is no doubt true, but in giving out our invitation we should not forget to mention the spiritual requirements expected of those who want to come. If we do that, we are not responsible for those who come only as a matter of custom. If, however, we invite organizations to come as a whole, we emphasize the mere fact of outward affiliation and obscure the need of spiritual discernment. The religious life is always in danger of becoming conventional. A dead formality takes the place of vital religion. We know how our Lord fought against this very thing; we know how the Reformers had the same task on their hands. It is true our own time does not take much stock in the externals of religion. Still, in certain quarters there is a revival of the belief in the efficacy of outward religious practices, in the magic power of the sacraments (see only the powerful Anglo-Catholic movement in the Episcopal Church). We ourselves are far from Catholicizing tendencies. Yet we do well to remember that the Lord's Supper works only harm when treated as an opus operatum; that, as Paul says, those who discern not the body of Christ eat and drink unto themselves a judgment. Who would want to be responsible for such a disastrous experience!

Toleranz.

„Toleranz ist das Hauptkennzeichen einer wahren Kirche. Sie fußt auf christlicher Liebe." So heißt es in einem Artikel in der „Christlichen Welt" (vom 5. Mai dieses Jahres). In diesem Artikel werden sogenannte „Friedhoffkandale" besprochen, die sich zuzeiten im alten Vaterland noch ereignen. Zum Beispiel beschließt eine Kirchengemeinde in Württemberg, daß „solchen, die aus der Landeskirche austreten und sich einer Sekte anschließen, im Todesfall die Beerdigung auf dem Gemeindekirchhof **in der Reihe der Gräber** unter allen Umständen verweigert sei." Sie sollen also irgendwie in einer Ecke, ähnlich wie Selbstmörder, beerdigt werden.

Intoleranz in diesem Sinn erscheint uns freilich eine mittelalterliche Rückständigkeit. Wenn wir von Toleranz oder Intoleranz reden, so denken wir an eine solche in Glaubenssachen. Nicht so wohl an die allgemeine Religionsfreiheit, wie solche, von den Täufern zuerst beansprucht, von Roger Williams tatsächlich in Rhode Island eingeführt worden ist, und durch die „Aufklärungs"-Bewegung sich in der protestantischen Welt durchgesetzt hat. Heutzutage spitzt sich die Forderung der Toleranz zu in dem Verlangen nach **Gleichberechtigung aller Richtungen in derselben Kirche.** Die „Bekenntnisse" der Kirche sollen nicht als „Lehrgesetze" benutzt werden. Die Pastoren und insonderheit die akademischen Lehrer, auch wenn sie auf die Symbole der Kirche verpflichtet werden, sollen damit

nicht an alle Einzelheiten gebunden sein. Ihre Unterschrift soll mehr nur eine allgemeine Zustimmung zu dem Wesentlichen des Bekenntnisses sein. Da sie zu einer andern Zeit, zu den Menschen unsrer Tage reden, so müssen sie in der Sprache und in den Denkformen des modernen Menschen sich ausdrücken.

Nur ganz wenige Kirchen halten an der Verbalinspiration fest; es folgt daraus, daß die Autorität der Bibel sich nicht auf alle Gebiete des menschlichen Lebens gleichermaßen erstreckt. Sie ist eine Urkunde der göttlichen Selbstoffenbarung, aber kein naturwissenschaftliches Textbuch. Sie hindert den Geologen, den Anthropologen nicht in seinen Forschungen. Die Wahrheit kann nur Eine sein, darum können Glaube und Wissenschaft im letzten Grund nicht zu entgegengesetzten Resultaten kommen. Freilich sagt die Bibel, der Mensch ist als Mensch geschaffen und das Tier als Tier, während die Naturwissenschaft die Evolution des Höheren aus dem Niederen, eine Abfolge aus dem Anorganischen ins Organische und aus dem Tierischen ins Menschliche behauptet. Im Einzelnen mag man sich da zu einem „Non liquet" entschließen, doch bleibt uns der Glaube an den Schöpfer unbestritten, was immer die Entwicklung des Lebens gewesen sein mag.

Doch naturgemäß, Forschung und Stellungnahme machen nicht halt bei diesen Fragen der Inspiration und bei dem Verhältnis von Naturwissenschaft und Bibelwort. Der Gottes- und Menschensohn steht im Mittelpunkt der Schrift, und die Frage ist heute so dringend wie je: Was dünket dich um **Christum?** Es genügt uns nicht, wenn gesagt wird, Christ sein heiße christlich leben, den Geist Christi haben. Es genügt uns nicht, in Christo bloß den Anreger und das Vorbild christlichen Lebens zu sehen, denjenigen, der den Gottesglauben und die Menschenliebe urbildlich uns vorgelebt hat und uns so in seine Nachfolge hineinzieht. Auf Grund der Schrift und der Erfahrung der ersten Christenheit sehen wir in ihm den **Bringer des Heils, den Mittler des neuen Bundes,** welcher Bund in seiner Selbsthingabe seine **Begründung** und **sein Siegel** findet. Den Geist Christi haben, leben wie er gelebt, ist freilich unser Ideal; wir sind aber fern von diesem Ziel, auch beim besten Leben. Wer könnte also auf seine unvollkommene Nachfolge **Gewißheit des Heils** gründen? Solche Gewißheit bringt nur der Glaube an ihn und sein Wort.

Gegen eine Lehre, die in Christo weniger sieht, können wir keine Toleranz üben. Es mag wahr sein, daß man in Christo den Heilsbringer sehen kann, ohne an seine Jungfrauengeburt zu glauben. Aber in der Regel machen diejenigen, welche diese leugnen oder bezweifeln, auch Abstriche an seiner Heilsbedeutung.

Von zwei Seiten erfährt die christliche Glaubenslehre heutzutage eine geringschätzige Behandlung: von den Soziologen und

von denen, die in starke Abhängigkeit von der Naturwissenschaft geraten sind. Die ersten legen allen Nachdruck auf die ethische Auswirkung des christlichen Geistes. In den verschiedensten Schattierungen sind sie sich darin eins, daß wir für das soziale Evangelium eine neue Theologie brauchen, und diese neue Theologie reduziert wesentliche Stücke des christlichen Glaubens.

Die Naturwissenschaftler erhoffen von der Erforschung der uns umgebenden Welt neues Licht über den ersten Artikel, das Wesen Gottes, seine Vorsehung, seine Weltregierung. Ihnen ist die Bibel in diesen Stücken keine autoritative Quelle mehr. Auch Jesus ist ihnen bloß ein Vorbild sittlichen Wandels. Was er von Gott, seinem Wesen und Walten, sagt, bedarf der Nachprüfung und Korrektur seitens der wissenschaftlichen Weltbetrachtung. (Siehe „Current Christian Thinking" von G. B. Smith, Juliheft des „Theologischen Magazins," Seite 318 ff., und „Religious Thought in the last Quarter Century" von demselben, Septemberheft des „Theologischen Magazins," Seite 397 ff.)

In allen Kirchen, von den altorthodoxen abgesehen, nehmen wir den Kampf der alten und neuen Meinungen wahr. Ebenso ist das Bestreben allgemein, die Kirchen vor zu großen Erschütterungen durch Maßhalten auf beiden Seiten zu bewahren; mit den Presbyterianern zu sprechen: eine „tolerationist attitude" einzunehmen. Man fühlt, daß die praktischen Aufgaben so groß und schwer sind, daß man nicht die Kräfte durch inneren dogmatischen Streit zersplittern darf. Das ist eine sehr lobenswerte Stellung; nur geht es nicht an, Lebensinteressen des Glaubens dem Opportunismus zum Opfer zu bringen.

Die Hin-nach-Rom-Bewegung in der Episkopalkirche.

In den Einigungsbewegungen der christlichen Kirchen unsrer Zeit haben die Episkopalen immer behauptet, daß ihrer Kirche die naturgemäße Mittlerrolle zufalle. Sie habe in ihrer Verfassung und ihrem Kultus sowohl katholische als protestantische Elemente, berühre sich also mit den Kirchen diesseits und jenseits der Reformation. Vielleicht könne man sagen, daß ihr von der Vorsehung die Aufgabe gestellt sei, die beklagenswerte Trennung der Glieder des Leibes Christi durch Anerkennung des beiderseitig Guten zu heilen. So ging denn auch die Einladung zu der Konferenz von Lausanne, die „on Faith and Order" beraten sollte, von ihr aus.

Inzwischen mag diese optimistische Auffassung von dem besondern Beruf der Episkopalkirche wohl etwas brüchig geworden sein. Die Einladung nach Lausanne ging an alle Kirchen aus. Die

Römisch-Katholischen schlugen rundweg ab. Die Griechisch-Katholischen waren freilich da, aber die Bedingungen, die sie für eine tatsächliche Einigung stellten, waren so hyperorthodox und mittelalterlich rückständig, daß wohl alle Protestanten sich der tiefen Kluft bewußt werden mußten. Mit der Einigung von Protestantismus und Katholizismus hat es also noch gute Wege.

Zur Einigung aber der protestantischen Kirchen allein fehlt es der Episkopalkirche an allem. Nicht nur wegen der apostolischen Sukzession und der Stellung ihres Episkopats. Das Haupthindernis ist das „Anglo-Catholic Movement," die Bewegung, die sich an Rom orientiert und nach Rom hinneigt. Diese Bewegung ist sehr stark in England, aber auch in unserm Land recht bedeutend. In England sollen 70 Prozent des Klerus dafür sein, bei uns etwa 40 Prozent. Und was den Anglo-Katholiken noch an Zahl abgeht, ersetzen sie durch Kühnheit und Geschlossenheit ihres Vorgehens. Diese Leute sehen sich nicht als Protestanten an. Die Reformation ist ihnen die beklagenswerte Ursache der Zersplitterung des Leibes Christi. Ihre Liebe und ihr Streben gehört den katholischen Charakterzügen der Kirche. Eine pomphafte Kultussymbolik und vor allem eine Hochspannung des sakramentalen Begriffes in dem kirchlichen Betrieb rücken sie in unmittelbare Nähe des Romanismus.

Die Priester sind die eigentlichen Rufer im Streit. Das Laienelement Englands wünscht keine Verpäpstlichung. Alle diese romanisierenden Korruptionen haben sich in die Kirche eingeschlichen, trotzdem das offizielle „Book of Common Prayer" sie nicht gestattet. Um diesem gesetzlosen Zustand ein Ende zu machen und zugleich den Anglo-Katholiken entgegenzukommen, haben die Bischöfe zweimal eine Revision des Gebetsbuches beim Parlament beantragt und sind zweimal abgewiesen worden. Das letzte Mal wurde die Annahme des Entwurfs hauptsächlich verweigert wegen des vorgeschlagenen Passus über die **Reservation** des Sakraments. Die „Church of England" glaubt an die Realpräsenz des Leibes Christi. Wenn die Elemente konsekriert sind, ist Christus wirklich da und muß angebetet werden. Die übergebliebenen Reste des Abendmahls (oder der „Messe" sollten nach dem Entwurf **reserviert** werden; aber als solche nicht angebetet, denn der Leib Christi ist nicht mehr gegenwärtig. Werden sie aber nachher etwa zur Krankenkommunion gebraucht, so vereinigt sich Christus wieder mit den Elementen (dynamisch, der Kraft nach).

Die Laien des Parlaments konnten weder die Logik dieser Messentheorie verstehen, noch wünschten sie solche magische Wandlungsmacht dem Priester zu verleihen, noch die (schließliche) Anbetung der Hostie zu gestatten.

So bleibt es also bei dem alten gesetzlosen Zustand. Die Prie-

ster werden sich dadurch nicht von ihren katholisierenden Neigungen abhalten lassen, und die Bischöfe sind meist auf ihrer Seite. Daß sich das Laienelement alle diese Dinge gefallen läßt, mag teils auf Gleichgültigkeit beruhen, teils auf Abneigung gegen religiöse Streitigkeiten, teils auch vielleicht auf der Sympathie des weiblichen Teiles der Bevölkerung.

Es steht schlimm, wie wir sehen, um den Protestantismus der Kirche Englands und eines großen Teiles der amerikanischen Episkopalkirche. Jedenfalls, wenn die Episkopalen wie bisher dem Romanismus das Feld freigeben, so ist es mit ihrer Mittlerrolle in den Einigungsbestrebungen Matthäi am letzten.

The Christian World

PROHIBITION: WHERE METHODISM STANDS

This declaration was unanimously adopted by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, at Kansas City, Mo., May, 1928

Prohibition is the fixed policy of the United States of America. The Eighteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution incorporated in the basic law of a great nation the underlying convictions of its people.

Liquor Traffic an Outlaw

The American nation is no longer in partnership with the liquor traffic. It has deprived that traffic of the sanction of law and the protection of government. That traffic is an outlaw, which no longer has standing as a lawful institution in the statutes and the courts of the nation. This alone constitutes one of the greatest victories for civic righteousness recorded in modern times.

This achievement represents the ripened conviction and the deliberate judgment of the American people after more than a hundred and fifty years of regulations, license, repression, taxation, government sale and attempted control, and every other method devised for the purpose of dealing with this nefarious habit and traffic.

The Results of Prohibition

The social, economic and moral benefits of this law have been amply demonstrated in increased industrial efficiency, a larger degree of safety on the highways and in the factories, unmatched productivity, unparalleled savings, unequaled public health records, a remarkable decrease in the national death rate and unprecedented evidences of social and moral well being.

The conservation of the higher values of manhood, reduced sorrows of womanhood and mitigated wrongs of childhood, eloquently proclaim the success of prohibition as a sound policy of government, which has made it "easier for men to do right and more difficult for men to do wrong."

Judged by all the evidence in the case of prohibition with enforcement at its worst is shown to be better than the legally sanctioned beverage alcohol with regulations at its best.

Orderly Government Challenged

The forces of greed, avarice, and appetite have challenged the authority of law, defied government, held up to contempt the fundamental principles of righteousness, and have flouted the expressed and properly recorded will of the American people.

In the face of such defiance we insist upon a more aggressive, unyielding and definite campaign of agitation, organization and education in the interest o our common objective. Total abstinence must be stressed; the vital importance of law observance as basic to ade-

quate law enforcement must be emphasized; there must be a revival of scientific temperance instruction in the public schools, the pulpit, the church school, the young people's societies and all other agencies of the Church must take an aggressive and constructive course of action. We speedily must get to the people the whole truth about the nature and effects of beverage alcohol; the truth about the real character and activities of the local, national and international liquor traffic; the truth about all methods tried or schemes proposed for the solution of the problem, and the truth about prohibition.

Issue Definite and Clear

We are not deceived by cunningly devised plans of the enemies of sobriety and prohibition to discount the work already accomplished. We demand clear and definite declarations on the part of candidates and parties appealing to our constituency for their suffrage.

We serve notice on all concerned that our attitude on this vital question is resolute and irreversible; that we will not be lulled into inactivity by evasive promises, indecisive declarations; that we will not support uncertain candidates for State and National legislative and administrative offices, and that we will not willingly tolerate in position of responsibility those who do not sustain the law and the principle of righteousness which the law represents.

A World Wide Problem

The beverage alcohol evil presents a world problem, which demands international cooperation. Permanency of prohibition in America requires international action, while the success of a world movement for sobriety depends upon the success of prohibition here. Prohibition is not safe anywhere until it has become the settled policy of government everywhere. We, therefore, pledge to our brothers in other countries our fullest possible cooperation in the struggle against the international traffic which now seeks not only to stem the tide of temperance advance in other lands, but to undermine and nullify prohibition in America.

Organized Activities

We commend and endorse the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in its national and international leadership among women; the Anti-Saloon League of America, our approved agency for cooperation with members of other churches and with temperance organizations in America for united effort against the common foe; and the World League Against Alcoholism in which are federated the principal anti-liquor organizations in the several countries for international interdenominational effort for temperance reform.

Especially do we urge upon our people everywhere increasingly to support and cooperate with Methodism's own agency in the field of moral reform. The Board of Temperance, Prohibition and Public Morals, with a record in the past of which we are justly proud, is planning even a greater program for the future, to which our people everywhere should rally with increased enthusiasm and confidence throughout the whole Church.

To all temperance and prohibition agencies and movements which are effectively and aggressively pressing for temperance and moral reform in America and abroad, we appeal for renewed activity and cooperative effort to the end that the moral forces of the nations shall speedily find the way to a world redeemed from the curse of beverage alcohol.

No Turning Back

This moral conflict must be prosecuted to final victory. We stop at no half-way station. We summon the enlightened public opinion and quickened public conscience of the nation and the world.

We will not countenance anarchy under a banner of personal liberty and social license; and we support the right of a free people to govern themselves. In this stretgic hour in the progress of this great reform there must be no minor note, no discordant sound, no equivocal stand.

We face the issue before us with confidence and determination. We believe in the common sense of the American people. We believe in the triumph of right. We believe in the hand of God in our national affairs.

We will not be stampeded; we will not retract; we will not cease to speak by tongue and pen and vote; we will not turn back; we have enlisted for the duration of the conflict, which will end only in the complete extermination of the beverage alcohol habit and traffic.

The Wet "World" Rebukes a Bishop

The New York World allows its wetness to befog its usually clear lenses. Otherwise how account for this fierce attack on Bishop James Cannon, Jr., for his activity at Houston in connection with the prohibition plank in the Democratic platform? The World says:

"Mr. James Cannon as a private citizen has a perfect right to express approval or disapproval of the Prohibition plank. But 'Bishop Cannon of the Methodist Church' has no place in politics and should be kept out of them. When the Texas Governor quotes the Bishop's approval—when, as The World's Houston dispatch puts it, he cites the Bishop, Carter Glass and Josephus Daniels and announces 'that because of them he would accept the majority plank'—then we see a church officer interfering with government in an entirely improper way. Mr. Cannon's opinion is of importance only because he claims to represent the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. When his approval or disapproval sways men at Houston it is because of an implied threat of the use of Methodist Church strength. He and Gov. Moody and their like are putting the Methodist Church into government, and every right-minded American should resent the attempt.

"What if some delegate had arisen at Houston and said that upon consulting the American Cardinals on this or that plank he had received a 'nihil obstat'? Yet in essence how much does Gov. Moody's statement differ from this? When any sect, Catholic or Jewish, Presbyterian or Methodist, interferes in politics, for the sake alike of a healthy religion

and a healthy state the functionaries responsible deserve a prompt and memorable rebuke."

Bishop Cannon, if we have the facts correctly, was at Houston as a member of the headquarters committee of the Anti-Saloon League, and not as a bishop. That would seem to make a difference which the World was bound in honesty to respect. Furthermore, the parallel of Methodist Bishop and Roman Cardinal is totally false. The Cardinal is a prince of a foreign church. He holds his commission from an alien power. The interference of a Roman Cardinal at Houston or Kansas City would have ruined the cause of his plank or his candidate, as the World knows perfectly well. We are not so sure that an American church made up of American citizens and taking no orders from an alien source, would not be justified in cases where moral principles are involved, in seeking a hearing in party conventions. In fact, this is precisely what the Methodist Episcopal Church did in both conventions, though its judgment was against placing any bishop upon these deputations. The World would better reserve its hysterics for a more serious situation, for, unless all signs fail, the nomination of an out-and-out liquor man for the presidency has stirred the dry churches as no other political issue has stirred them in a generation. The rough treatment which the World gives to Bishop Cannon may seem to it to be "a prompt and memorable rebuke," but if we mistake not, it will not be so taken by him or the millions of his fellow churchmen, mostly Southern Methodists, and mostly of his mind as to platform and candidates. Methodists are so accustomed to receiving rebukes from wet newspapers that they thrive under such treatment.

"They Feared the People"

We do not compare the issues before the recent Republican and Democratic national conventions with those dealt with by the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem in the year 29, except, that in both instances the representatives of authority heeded the demands of the people. Neither great political party in the United States was persuaded by the clamors of the wets to go to the polls with a plank in its platform promising even a modification of the Volstead Act, let alone a resubmission of the Eighteenth Amendment to the voters. Both conventions were given a chance. At Kansas City Dr. Butler, president of a great university, and at Houston, Mr. Ritchie, governor of a great state, advocated opening the question. The proposal of both was denied.

To as great a degree as can possibly occur in American political life, the quadrennial conventions that nominate candidates for the presidency reflect the will of the populace. This is truer today than ever in the past, because not only the press but the radio put the party into direct touch with current opinion. There is also a reasonable certainty that both nominating conventions this year were "unbossed and unbought." Everybody knows that the people are aroused and that next November's ballot boxes will come nearer containing a competent expression of the views of the individual Americans of both sexes than

at any election in the last hundred years. The politicians evidently felt that they must so frame their platform on the use of alcohol in beverages as to meet the wishes of the voters. Their declarations favoring enforcement of the existent law and the Eighteenth Amendment can be explained in no other way.

It is because conventions to nominate candidates for the presidency are guided in their decisions as to the platform by what they think the people want that this year's platform pronouncements on alcoholic beverages are of primary importance. President Butler and Governor Ritchie claimed that the majority of the voters "are wet." Beyond doubt, they spoke for a certain portion of the people. Borah and Carter Glass say the majority of the voters "are dry." They based their claim on resolutions passed by churches and women's societies, by the complexion of Congress and legislatures and by expressions of opinion gotten in circles to whom the big secular dailies and the radicals pay little attention. It is generally assumed that the ardent wets will vote. Unless those for whom Borah and Carter Glass spoke actually deposit their ballots next November, and prior to election day give unmistakable approval of the platform's plain meaning, laws lifting the ban on liquor drinking will be passed.

The American people are patient with transgressors of principle, and easy going. But in no instance in their history have they surrendered high moral ideals to profiteers and exploiters of the poor and the week. It is a "paramount duty" of the defenders of sobriety and efficiency to back up with voice and vote the majority of delegates to the Kansas City and Houston conventions. If insincerity or ambiguity in a platform exists, its proponents should be rebuked at the polls.

—*The Lutheran.*

Noguchi a Martyr to Medical Research

By Watson Davis

Managing Editor, *Science Service*, Washington

Without the blare of bugles and the blaze of flags, in the quiet stillness of laboratories, there are those who died not alone for their country but for humanity. The list of scientific martyrs is long and the gifts of their sacrifices have been many. In the records there is now inscribed the name of Dr. Hideyo Noguchi.

Japanese by race, scientist by profession, he was a part of an American effort to conquer a disease that constitutes a menace to the civilization of at least three continents. He did his last work in Africa, making a further attack upon yellow fever which, through his efforts and those of his colleague, had practically been banished from the Americas, once its stronghold. The world was Noguchi's country. Just a year ago before he took up the fight against *Leptospira*, the causative organism of yellow fever which he exposed to the world, he discovered the cause of trachoma, the eye disease that blinds so many of the American Indians. Telling attacks upon syphilis and smallpox were made by Noguchi and he also contributed to the knowledge of many other diseases.

It may take months or years for the medical world to estimate the importance and value of the most recent researches of Noguchi. When he was stricken with the disease he insisted that samples of his own blood be taken from his body for inoculation of monkeys. His associates are carrying on with the cultures that he left. When the tests are completed it may be that it will be possible to settle definitely the ancient controversy as to whether there are one or two forms of the dread "yellow jack"—one American, the other African. Then it will be possible, perhaps, to lay the blame for the origin of yellow fever upon Africa, whence the disease was carried to America by the slave trade.

During work on yellow fever in South America in 1918 Noguchi isolated a germ believed to be the cause of yellow fever. From it he developed a preevntive vaccine and a serum that proved fairly efficacious if used within two or three days after the onset of the disease. Campaigns against the deadly stegomyia mosquito, carrier of the disease, practically stamped out the infection in the Western Hemisphere, but it continued to be a serious menace in West Africa. It is important that the disease be suppressed in Western Africa before a transcontinental railway is opened. Otherwise the yellow fever would be carried not only to the east of the African continent, but also to teeming Oriental countries in which the stegomyia, the yellow fever mosquito, thrives. Health authorities quail at what might happen if the infection spread to this region. Once the mosquitos of India and Southern China were infected the yellow fever would take great toll among the unsanitary homes of those countries.

With such a prospect it is understandable that a determined effort is being made to smother the disease in its last stronghold. The International Health Board of the Rockefeller Foundation established the laboratory in which Noguchi was working at Lagos, Nigeria. A staff, highly trained, has been at work on the problem for several years. In South America Noguchi was able to transfer the disease to monkeys or even guinea pigs, but workers in Africa for a long period found it impossible to inoculate any animals, a condition that indicated that the disease is different in the Eastern and Western Hemisphere, despite the similarity of the outward aspects of the disease on both sides of the South Atlantic. Finally, however, monkeys of the variety known as *Macacus rhesus* were infected with typical African yellow fever. Instrumental in this achievement was Dr. Adrian Stokes, a British investigator, at Lagos laboratory, who gave his life as a result of the researches. Like Noguchi he succumbed to the disease with which he worked. But his work constituted an important step, since it did away with the necessity in studying the African form for volunteer human victims, such as were called for by the United States Army Commission in Havana in 1900. At the same time the workers were unable to find the causative Leptospira in the patients' blood. It almost seemed as if the two diseases had different origins.

Since Dr. Noguchi was generally conceded to know more about this particular group of germs than any other living person, he un-

dertook the African trip last Fall to see if he could separate the two diseases. Perhaps his skillful crippled hands, famous throughout the realm of bacteriology for their technique with test tube and microscope, could demonstrate *Leptospira icteroides* where others had failed, or even show an entirely different cause. While at work he contracted the disease and died. From the evidence now at hand authorities at the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research are inclined to believe that the work he left indicates that there are two distinct forms of the disease.

As these lines are being written the news comes that Dr. William Alexander Young, Director of Medical Research, died from yellow fever at Accra, on the Gold Coast, on May 30. He was assistant to Dr. Noguchi in investigating the disease which has now been fatal to three important research workers.—*Current History.*

Science Misapplied—Engineers and War

From The Manchester Guardian Weekly, June 8.

Representative engineers from all parts of the British Commonwealth and from many foreign countries have been in London this week attending the centenary celebrations of the Institution of Civil Engineers—incorporated by royal charter June 3, 1928.

The most interesting event was the delivery of the James Forrest lecture on "A century of inventions" by Sir Alfred Ewing, one of the most distinguished of living engineers, who during the war was in charge of the department of the Admiralty dealing with enemy cipher. His survey of a hundred years of scientific progress concluded with a discussion of the question: What is left for the future engineer to do?

"Can," he asked, "the recent astounding pace of discovery and invention be maintained? Or does a time approach when engineers will sit down like so many Alexanders to lament a too completely conquered world of mechanical things, just as a time comes to geographers when there are no more regions to explore? Transport, especially by air, may be made less perilous and more convenient. Communication may be extended to include vision; that is half done already, and I confess to no enthusiasm for the other half. Power will certainly be more generally distributed.

"But can we expect the engineers of the coming century to bring about developments in the application of natural resources comparable to those of the past hundred years? I am, as I said, no prophet, but I doubt it. To me it seems more likely that there will be something of a lull in the revolutionary fervor of the engineer. Social changes—drastic social changes—may be looked for, but not, I think, so directly consequent on his activities as in the century now ending.

"It may very well happen that the mental energy of mankind now flowing so strongly in this channel of ours will seek and find outlets in other directions. While as engineers we may regret such an issue, we cannot but admit that it may prove beneficial to the human race,

since beyond question there is grave need for progress of quite a different kind.

"For the fact remains that all our efforts to apply the sources of power in nature to the use and convenience of man, successful as they are in creating for him new capacities, new comforts, new habits, leave him at bottom much what he was before. I used as a young teacher to think that the splendid march of discovery and invention, with its penetration of the secrets of nature, its consciousness of power, its absorbing mental interest, its unlimited possibilities of benefit, was, in fact, accomplishing some betterment of the character of man. I thought that the assiduous study of engineering could not fail to soften his primitive instincts, that it must develop a sense of law and order and righteousness.

"But the war came, and I realized the *moral failure of applied mechanics*. It was a shock to find that a nation's eminence in this department of intellectual effort did nothing to prevent a reversion to savagery, conscienceless, unbridled, made only the more brutal by its vastly enhanced ability to hurt. I saw that the wealth of products and ideas with which the engineer had enriched mankind might be prostituted to ignoble use. It served to equip the nations with engines of destruction incomparably more potent and ruthless than any known before. We had put into the hand of civilization a weapon far deadlier than the weapons of barbarism, and there was nothing to stay her hand.

"Civilization, in fact, turned the weapon upon herself. The arts of the engineer had, indeed, been effectively learnt, but they *had not changed man's soul*. In our diligent cultivation of these arts we engineers have perhaps forgotten that progress in them has far outstripped the ethical progress of the race. We have given the child a sharp-edged tool before he has the sense to handle it wisely. We have given him the power to do irreparable mischief when he hardly knows the difference between right and wrong.

"Does it not follow that the *duty of leadership* is to *educate his judgment* and *his conscience?* Collective moral sense, collective political responsibility, the divine maxim to do to others as we would that they should do to us—these are lessons in respect of which all the nations, even the most progressive, have still much to learn.

"There are people who talk glibly of the next great war. I wonder if they know how near in the last war the world came to destruction through misapplying the endowment which it owes to the engineer. Do they realize that with added experience and further malignant ingenuity the weapons of a future war will be more than ever deadly, more than ever indiscriminate, and the peril to civilization will be indefinitely increased?

"Surely it is for the engineer, as much as any man, to *pray for a spiritual awakening*, to strive after such a growth of sanity as will prevent the gross misuse of his good gifts. For it is the engineer who, in the course of his labors to promote the comfort and convenience of man, has put into man's unchecked and careless hand a monstrous potentiality of ruin."

The Christian Herald's Church Census, 1927

THE REV. H. K. CARROLL, LL.D.

Denominations	Summary in 1927			Gains in 1927		
	Ministers	Churches	Commun'ts	Min.	Chs.	Com.
Adventists (5 bodies)	1,567	2,935	151,862	d3	d84	971
American Rescue Workers	554	170	7,926	29	5	70
Assemblies of God	1,457	1,353	72,143	187	279	10,101
Baptists (14 bodies)	52,133	60,010	8,712,607	d451	d2,093	41,712
Brethren (Dunkards) (4 bodies)	3,304	1,286	162,034	d29	d23	5,266
Brethren (Plymouth) (6 bodies)	....	633	22,961	....	164	9,244
Brethren (River) (3 bodies)	209	114	4,986	43	25	109
Buddhist Oriental Temples	34	12	5,639	....	....	....
Catholic Apostolic	13	13	2,768	....	....	....
Catholics (Eastern) (10 bodies)	696	684	762,425	12	7	8,245
Catholics (Western) (3 bodies)	25,923	18,438	16,854,691	1,211	944	183,889
Christadelphians	....	78	3,980	....	d1	d81
Christian and Missionary Alliance	410	392	25,000	10	16	1,900
Christian Church	1,177	1,157	109,641	160	141	d4,495
Christian Union	390	325	18,200	....	....	....
Church of Christ, Scientist (a)	3,926	1,963	....	d650	d325	....
Church of God, Reformation Movement	1,921	927	34,709	97	250	4,659
Churches of God (Winebrenner)	424	466	28,606	d28	d22	d405
Churches of God and Ss. of Christ (Col.)	200	94	3,311	99	....	....

Denominations	Summary in 1927			Gains in 1927		
	Ministers	Churches	Commun'ts	Min.	Chs.	Com.
Churches of God, General Assembly	300	200	4,628	d623	d466	d16,448
Churches of Living God (Col.)	185	200	5,000	30	....	d1,000
Church of the Nazarene	2,855	1,583	68,612	354	35	4,789
Communists (2 bodies)	....	13	1,577	....	....	d207
Congregationalists (b)	5,510	5,636	914,698	....	....	....
Disciples of Christ (2 bodies)	9,781	14,140	1,799,313	403	d442	44,801
Evangelical Church	1,990	2,184	217,935	13	41	9,764
Evangelistic Associations (13 bodies)	650	272	17,847	206	65	3,914
Evangelical Synod of North America	1,197	1,301	236,118	30	d23	3,451
Free Christian Zion (Col.)	20	35	6,225	....	....	....
Friends (4 bodies)	1,364	913	113,605	d5	d51	d1,847
Jewish Congregations	721	1,901	257,135	....	....	....
Latter-Day Saints (2 bodies)	6,287	1,716	645,158	d4,116	33	8,769
Lutherans (20 bodies)	10,727	15,448	2,656,158	d68	d101	67,879
Mennonites (12 bodies)	1,581	966	97,544	57	d52	7,234
Methodists (16 bodies)	45,598	62,864	9,119,575	1,177	291	150,910
Moravians (2 bodies)	155	172	29,941	d2	....	822
New Jerusalem Churches (2 bodies)	113	96	6,521	10	3	d31
Non-sectarian Bible Faith Churches	119	106	6,281	....	....	....
Pilgrim Holiness	750	441	15,040	32	23	640
Holiness	28	32	861	....	d1	d65
Pentecostal Holiness	282	192	8,096	....	....	2,743

Denominations	Summary in 1927			Gains in 1927		
	Ministers	Churches	Commun'ts	Min.	Chs.	Com.
Pillar of Fire	14	19	784	....	....	....
Presbyterian (9 bodies)	14,429	15,398	2,597,136	d9	d106	d13,580
Protestant Episcopal	5,830	7,845	1,190,938	37	14	17,259
Reformed (3 bodies)	2,408	2,737	553,641	d13	13	6,617
Reformed Episcopal	70	68	8,622	....	....	....
Salvation Army	4,670	1,704	81,224	56	49	3,535
Scandinavian Evangelical (3 bodies)	606	505	48,590	d20	28	5,332
Schwenkfelders	7	6	1,666	....	....	77
Social Brethren	21	22	1,800	....	....	....
Spiritualists	600	690	75,000	....	....	....
Temple Society	2	2	164	....	....	d96
Unitarians	466	370	62,240	d16	2	3,527
United Brethren (2 bodies)	2,130	3,454	413,818	d95	d50	3,187
Universalists	492	546	48,221	26	d58	d1,573
United Evangelical Church	120	152	21,533	10	....	470
Volunteers of America	512	133	28,756	....	....	1,855
Independent Congregations	267	879	48,673	....	....	....
Grand Total in 1927	217,204	235,991	48,594,163	d1,387	d1,470	573,723

(d) Decrease. (a) The Losses are only apparent, occasioned by inclusion of readers and churches in foreign lands. (b) Statistics are for 1926. Those for 1927 will not be ready until May.

Dr. Bowie Estimates the Anglo-Catholic

Dr. Bowie's article, "Prayer Book, Priests and Protestants," which appeared in the June *Forum* deals so clearly with the Anglo-Catholic attitude toward Reservation and Adoration that *The Chronicle* believes its readers will be glad to have their attention called to its salient points.

Dr. Bowie is discussing the matter of the Revised Book rejected by the House of Commons. But what he says applies with peculiar aptness to the American Anglo-Catholic as well.

The crucial matter, he says justly, upon which the rejection rested is "specifically the permission granted therein for reservation of the sacrament." As is well-known, reservation is at present illegal in the Church of England in spite of the fact that many Bishops tacitly allow it. By the Revised Book reservation is, with the Bishop's consent, permitted.

The English people, as Dr. Bowie points out, believe that "the matter of a more convenient way of administering to the sick is not the real reason why reservation is desired." The Anglo-Catholic wishes it because "it may be the focus for a particular kind of worship."

Certain Anglo-Catholics for example believe that Christ is actually present in the bread and wine and therefore, when reserved, these elements should be adored as Christ Himself.

"At the present time in scores of English parishes the reserved sacrament is actually made the center of worship in the church. Not singular, but typical of a great number of other parishes is the sign in one of the London churches. 'The Blessed Sacrament is perpetually reserved on the north side of the altar; it is hoped that no one will leave the church without an act of homage to the Presence which is in our midst.' "

In this way an idea of the miraculous is injected into our religion which tends to create a belief in the magical power of the priest, and which leads to "authoritarian ideas of the church which also are most completely represented by the Church of Rome." "Philosophically and historically it is true that the religion which magnifies the miraculous as the vehicle of the spirit is likely to shut religion up into shrines and cloisters and corners and leave the mass of mankind unleavened. The Roman Church is the most conspicuous and thorough-going example of the same type of religion which Anglo-Catholics desire." Dr. Bowie correctly states that "the same Anglo-Catholic influences which insist upon the reserved sacrament are definitely bent upon the attempt to accomplish reunion with Rome, even at the price of submission to the headship of the Pope." This is clearly shown by the report of the Malines Conferences.

Under these circumstances it is not hard to understand why the Englishman refused the Revised Book.

The danger attendant upon the Anglo-Catholic movement is that those who participate in it are thoroughly convinced of the justice of their acts and being so convinced can brook no opposition. They con-

ceive it their duty to bring the rest of the Church to their point of view. Their stand is precisely the opposite to tolerance. The Englishman sensed this and the House of Commons rejected the Revised Book "because it intuitively perceived that what the Anglo-Catholics ask for is not tolerance. They seek dominance, to the farthest limits to which their ecclesiastical influence may reach. They wish to control the religious life of The Church of England and stamp it all with their unyielding pattern."

Nor is the American Anglo-Catholic one bit different. With propriety Dr. Bowie quotes from the *American Church Monthly* of June, 1923, "Toleration of Catholic Faith and worship is not our aim. We most firmly believe that Catholicism is the Christian religion—the truth and the whole truth so far as religion is concerned. We know the Catholic Church was founded by God, to be his mouthpiece. Our aim is to convert men to this religion, not just to be allowed peacefully to practice it."

It is against this movement and all it implies that Dr. Bowie properly warns. He recognizes that if we are to preserve our protestantism there is no use of crying peace, when there is no peace. When "The Anglo-Catholics are willing to remember that the Church is meant to be a family of brothers and not a monarchy of undeviating laws; then there can be peace within the Church of England, and within the other communions affiliated with that Church. But until that change comes there is likelihood of much collision."

—*The Chronicle.*

The Folly of a Retreat From Our Protestant Traditions

To the Editor of THE CHRONICLE:

Two evil influences overhang the meeting of our next General Convention; (1) The danger that the extreme Anglo-Catholic Party will so far control the Convention as to strike out the Thirty-Nine Articles from the Prayer Book, and otherwise commit our Church to medievalism and anti-Protestant thought; (2) That the Convention will be blind to the overwhelming and terrible need for a real spiritual awakening of our church and nation, such as shall amount to a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness in a very true sense.

The attention of your readers should be directed to the first of these dangers. The thought that I would impress upon readers of *The Chronicle* is one that is not, perhaps, considered often enough, or seriously enough. It is this: If the extremists succeed in ridding the Church of its Protestant life and character, what position will be left to us that will make us at all useful to the people of this country? What will justify our continued existence as a church? What especial claim can we have upon the thought and life of the American people? Apparently we should have little or no claim upon the attention of earnest and thoughtful men and women. Having rejected the Reformation and that particular form of evangelical truth for which the Reformation stands, we should necessarily leave to our sister protestant

churches all that great and moving appeal which, for example, the Methodist, the Presbyterian, and the Congregational communions, make so successfully to the hearts, consciences and intellects of thousands of persons. I refer to such truths as the following: The immediate communion between God and the human soul, without priestly intervention; the soul's overwhelming need of a personal Redeemer; an open Bible; the right of private judgment and of free inquiry. These things have, in the past, moved mountains of unbelief, and have made men tremble and ask "What shall we do to be saved?" If deprived of the ability to lay these great truths before the world, and to lay them with emphasis, we should be a church without the Spirit of God.

On the other hand, we should make but a lame and sorry figure in an attempt to play the role of a church that glorified in a powerful ecclesiastical organization, with a vast and well-ordered hierarchy, essaying to relieve the individual soul of the settlement of all vexatious and troublesome questions as to life here and salvation hereafter. To the class of minds that like this particular aspect of Christianity, our appeal would be but weak and ineffective. We should be handicapped in seeking to address ourselves to those who hold a faith that is largely unthinking, and we are ready to yield unquestioning obedience. The great Roman communion is a thousandfold more likely to secure the allegiance and enthusiasm of those who place a very high estimate upon the importance of religious organization and priestly authority, and who care little for the right of private judgment, or the doctrine of an inward light and communion between the soul and its Maker. For this class of minds, Rome has the traditions, the experience, and the claim of centuries behind her. Our church would be outgeneraled and outbidden by her at every turn and corner. We should be like David in Saul's armor, wholly unaccustomed to the weapons we were trying to wield.

Consider the whole organization and temper of our church, and one will hardly remain in much doubt. Our Bishops possess only a very moderate degree of control over their clergy; witness the impudent reply of a certain arrogant Anglo-Catholic priest to Bishop Seaman of Texas, who rebuked him for strange and unchurchly practises. Or, again, recall the caution which the Bishop of New York felt obliged to exercise a few year ago, in dealing with a Rector who was thoroughly out of sympathy and out of harmony with the Bishop and a large part of the clergy and laity of the Diocese. Indeed, when a large body of the clergy of any Diocese chance to be in opposition to their Bishop, they can thwart and neutralize his influence to an amazing degree without at any time exposing themselves to ecclesiastical trial or to severe discipline. His power over them is small.

As for our laity, they rest their obedience to, and respect for a Bishop upon the man's character, zeal, learning and unselfish devotion, more than anything else, though without belittling the regularity and sacredness of his orders. They can never be permanently whipped into subjection.

Thus we see that our Church would be likely to "fall between two stools." We should be neither Catholic enough to suit the one class, nor Protestant enough to make our voice heard by those who have long been used to listen to us with respect. With our usefulness thus greatly impaired, it would not be long before the whole organization of our Church would suffer from something very much like a spiritual and moral dry-rot. Like the nobility in France at the time of the great Revolution, our Church would be swept aside as something that no longer had an excuse for cumbering the ground.

May God Almighty spare us from such an unspeakable calamity, and May He make us all realize the truth of those great words, "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts."

William Allmand Robertson.

East Orange, N. J., June 14, 1928. —*The Chronicle.*

"Al Smith for President"

The above is the caption of a very striking editorial from the pen of Mr. Carlton M. Sherwood, Extension Secretary of the International Society of Christian Endeavor. Among other things, Mr. Sherwood says:

"We are going to witness an interesting psychology in the campaign to elect Governor Alfred E. Smith, of New York, to the presidency of the United States.

"It is nothing new to New Yorkers, but it will be to the nation.

"The Smith forces are going to appeal to the American spirit of fair play and religious tolerance by emphasizing constantly that any opposition whatsoever to Governor Smith is caused by opposition to his Roman Catholic religious faith.

"Their campaign will be clever. It will make its appeal to a large number of citizens who pride themselves on their 'broadmindedness.'

"Thus a cleverly concealed spirit and campaign of religious intolerance will make an appeal to the average American's genuine spirit of religious forbearance.

"For myself, as a Democrat, I shall oppose Governor Smith for nomination or election to the presidency, first because he is a 'wet,' second, because of his Tammany Hall training and associations, and third, because I believe that his ability and achievements in statecraft have been greatly overrated for political purposes. In my judgment, as a political figure aspiring to the presidency, in ability and leadership he is less than ordinary.

"Personally, I shall refuse to allow any group to lead me to support any man because of his religious faith, just as I would refuse to oppose any man for the same reason.

"It is well to oppose religious intolerance wherever one finds it. It is un-American. It is also well to understand on which foot the shoe fits."

In the opinion of the Christian Herald, Mr. Sherwood has made a correct and clear statement of the case. Since his editorial has appeared, Judge Olvany, recognized as the titular leader of Tammany Hall, testifying before the Senate committee investigating primary campaign expenditures, has assured the waiting world that Tammany is in no sense a political organization! And now, little children, stand around and I shall tell you another bedtime story!—*D. A. P., Christian Herald.*

Totengräber der Kirche.

Und wieder ein neuer schmerzlicher Pastorenfall. Diesmal in Ostpreußen, der Fall von Holland, Pfarrer in Grünhagen bei Tapiau. Er hebt sich von den andern, kürzlich berichteten Fällen durch seine Unglaublichkeit ab, unglaublich wegen der völligen Absage eines evangelischen Pfarrers von Bibel und Bekenntnis, sodann wegen einer seltenen Dreistigkeit gegen die vorgesetzte Kirchenbehörde. Der Fall wurde durch die neuen Richtlinien des Konsistoriums in Königsberg für den Konfirmandenunterricht veranlaßt, die Pfarrer Holland in nachfolgendem Schreiben (abgedruckt mit sichtlicher Genugtuung in der „Lehrerzeitung für Ost- und Westpreußen" vom 27. April 1928) zurückwies, Datum: 23. Februar 1928:

„Dem Evangelischen Konsistorium zu Königsberg, Pr.

erkläre ich hierdurch, daß ich mich weigere, die Richtlinien für den Konfirmandenunterricht anzunehmen, welche die Verfügung Nr. 7178 des Kirchlichen Amtsblatts enthält:

Es ist geradezu ein Verbrechen an der deutschen Seele und an dem gotterschaffenen Geist unsers deutschen Volks, wenn der Lehrgang des Kirchlichen Unterrichts durch den Lutherschen Katechismus bestimmt wird, der vor 400 (vierhundert!) Jahren für die Zeit vor 400 Jahren und dazu noch als Notbehelf von Luther verfaßt wurde. In damaliger Zeit mag der Katechismus seinen Zweck erfüllt haben, für die deutsche Seele der Gegenwart ist er einfach ungenießbar.

Im Einverständnis mit vielen aufrechten, treu gesinnten und denkenden deutschen Männern und Frauen erkläre ich, daß ich zu keiner Zeit meines Lebens durch Sätze des Lutherschen Katechismus erhoben, gestärkt, beseligt, geläutert worden bin, sondern durch das Kennenlernen des großen Reichtums, den uns Gott durch unsre deutsche Natur, durch unsre deutsche Dichtung, Kunst und Weisheit und durch all dies unsäglich herrliche unerschöpfbare deutsche Geistes- und Herzensgut verliehen hat. —

Es ist die Pflicht einer deutschen Kirche, sich auf dies deutsche Geistes- und Herzensgut, als Ganzes gesehen, zu gründen und nicht ein einzelnes der Vergangenheit angehörendes Zeugnis und Bekenntnis, wie es der Lutherische Katechismus darstellt, zur Richtschnur zu nehmen. Das wäre das ärgste Mißverstehen des kühnen, seiner Zeit in vielem weit vorauseilenden Luthergeistes, der auf keinen Fall durch seinen Katechismus das religiöse Leben der kommenden Jahrhunderte am Gängelband führen wollte. —

Um in Luthers Sinn zu handeln, müssen wir über Luther hinausschreiten. Das gilt auch in bezug auf unsre Stellung zu den biblischen Schriften.

Für Luther waren die biblischen Schriften damals ein unendlich wertvolles Stärkungs- und Kampfmittel. Sein glühendes Herz und sein kühner Geist legten freilich in die Aussagen der biblischen Schriftsteller oft mehr hinein, als darin enthalten ist.

Für uns Deutsche des 20. Jahrhunderts können die biblischen Schriften nicht mehr die Bedeutung haben, welche sie für Luther hatten. In dem vorhin erwähnten großen deutschen Herzens-, Geistes- und Naturgut, als Ganzes gesehen, hat uns Gott eine weit herrlichere, tiefere, uns gemäßere Offenbarung gegeben, als sie die Bibel uns zu vermitteln vermag. Weder die Sätze der Bergpredigt, noch die Erörterungen des Paulus in seinen Briefen an Römer, Korinther usw., geschweige denn die Werke des Moses, Ezechiel, Salomo, Judas usw. vermögen die deutsche Seele so im Innersten zu ergreifen, zu beseligen, zu läutern, zu trösten und zu erheben, wie das aus deutschem Geist heraus geborene Worte und Weisen vermögen. Unser Volk, soweit es gesund ist, greift nicht zu Lukas, Paulus und Moses, sondern zu **Paul Gerhardt, Claudius** und, soweit dies wieder erweckt wird, zum **deutschen Volkslied** und zum tiefsinnigen **deutschen Märchen.** Auch ist der „gemeine Mann" und vor allem seine Kinder für die Schätze unsrer großen **klassischen Dichtung** und überhaupt für das gewaltige deutsche Geistes-, Herzens- und Naturgut weit aufgeschlossener als die meisten unsrer „Gebildeten", wie ich aus nunmehr 14 Amtsjahren weiß, die ich in Stadt und Land zugebracht, vielmehr denkend, fühlend und mich weiter entwickelnd durchlebt habe. —

Diejenigen Kreise unsers Volks, welche sich einseitig auf die Bibel gründen, sind durchweg als ungesund zu bezeichnen. Die Bibel mag in mancher Hinsicht **eine** der Wurzeln des deutschen Geistesbaums sein, doch Baumwurzeln läßt man ruhen und erfreut sich und stärkt sich an den herrlichen Früchten des deutschen Geistesbaums.

Eine deutsche Kirche hat daher **nicht** die Aufgabe, dem deutschen Volk heute Bibelsätze zu predigen, sondern deutsches edelstes Geistes- und Herzensgut zu vermitteln. Die besten unsrer Choräle werden da ihren Ehrenplatz immer behaupten, neue werden geschaffen werden.

Statt der bisher üblichen biblischen Schriftverlesungen bringe ich längst Worte deutscher Geister, z. B. von Luther, Schleiermacher, Kant, Fichte, Arndt usw. Ueberhaupt suche ich jeden Gottesdienst dem Gedächtnis eines deutschen großen Geistes zu weihen. So habe ich Walter Flex, Eichendorff, Schenkendorff, Schleiermacher, Arndt, Kant, Lessing u. a. gefeiert und werde auf diesem Weg fortschreiten, unbeirrt dadurch, daß ein Teil der Gemeinde dies Bestreben ablehnt. Die gesunden Geister unter Alten und Jungen werden sich immer mehr anschließen und es wird ihr Schade nicht sein.

Auch meinen Konfirmandenunterricht sowie die Arbeit in unsrer Jugendgruppe habe ich ganz nach den oben gezeichneten Ueberzeugungen aufgebaut und tue damit an der deutschen Seele einen besseren Dienst, als wenn ich mit Katechismus und Bibel daherkäme. — So handle ich nach meinem Gewissen und bin von dem Sieg meiner Richtung überzeugt. Hierdurch habe ich meine Ablehnung der behördlicherseits gegebenen Richtlinien für den Konfirmandenunterricht genügend begründet. —

Die Verlängerung des kirchlichen Unterrichts um ein Jahr halte ich

für unsre Verhältnisse für unnötig, ja für kaum durchführbar; denn ein großer Teil der Kinder der hiesigen großen Gemeinde hat weite Wege bis zum Kirchort zurückzulegen. Die Kinder noch außer dem Schulunterricht an freien Nachmittagen zum Konfirmandenunterricht zu bestellen, halte ich für eine zwecklose Ueberlastung der jugendlichen Körper und Geister. Die (in der Verfügung des kirchlichen Amtsblatts genannten) „christlichen ernsten Eltern," welche von einer Verdoppelung der kirchlichen Unterrichtszeit so viel erwarten, betrachte ich mit Mißtrauen: wenn sie solche Erwartungen hegen, sind sie mehr töricht und trübselig als ernst und nachdenkend. Auch habe ich oft hinter derartigen „frommen" Wünschen weiter nichts als Heuchelei und Wichtigtuerei gefunden. —

Bezüglich der im Kirchlichen Amtsblatt Nr. 7193 „Häusliche Feier der Einsegnung" gegebenen Anweisung, durch Verbreitung des mit Worten sehr hochgreifenden Flugblatts „An die Eltern unsrer Konfirmanden" oder durch ähnliche Ermahnungen für bessere Begehung des Einsegnungstags zu wirken, bemerke ich, daß solche Ermahnungen nichts fruchten können, so lange die Pfarrer nicht mit eigenem Beispiel vorangehen und auf jeden Alkoholgenuß verzichten. Das wird nur möglich sein bei gleichzeitiger Enthaltung von Tabak u. dgl. Reizmitteln, wozu im großen und ganzen auch das Fleisch gehört.

Die in den Deutschen Wandervogel-Bünden zusammengefaßte Jugend hat schon seit Jahrzehnten um des Vaterlands willen auf jeglichen Alkohol, Tabak, ja, zum Teil auch auf Fleischgenuß verzichtet und wirkt durch ihr Beispiel ohne tönende biblische Worte weit erhebender als die den wirklichen Volksschäden wortreich und machtlos gegenüberstehende Kirche. Ich selbst bin durch das wortlose Beispiel junger Wandervögel völlig frei von Alkohol, Tabank und Tierfleisch geworden und habe durch Vereinfachung meiner Lebensweise immer mehr Kräfte für bessere Dinge frei bekommen. —

Von der Art des „Wandervogels" könnte die Kirche überhaupt viel lernen, statt immer in die Bahnen ungesunden „Gemeinschafts-Christentums" zu geraten, welches nur Heuchler und Frömmler, aber nicht aufrechte, treue, deutsche Menschenkinder groß zieht.

Rudolf Holland, Pfarrer."

Also ein evangelischer Pfarrer, der den Katechismus seiner Kirche feierlich verwirft und im Gottesdienst die Bibel nicht mehr verliest, dem die Bibel eine abgestandene „Wurzel" ist, die man „ruhen läßt." Es ist ja für Ostpreußen keine Ueberraschung, was Pf. Holland schreibt. Seit länger als 10 Jahren ist er durch seine Eigenartigkeiten bekannt und hat die Geduld des Konsistoriums auf die Probe gestellt. Dieser neue Vorstoß scheint endlich die Geduld erschöpft zu haben; wie man hört, ist er zunächst beurlaubt, und man erwartet seine endgültige Ausscheidung aus dem Kirchendienst. In der Tat dürfte ein Mann mit solchen Anschauungen in der Kirche nichts mehr zu tun haben. („Allg. Luth. Kchztg.")

Book Review

(When ordering books, please mention this Magzaine.)
NOTE—Reviews, when not signed, are by the Editor.

Those Disturbing Miracles, by *Lloyd C. Douglas.* Harper and Brothers, publishers, New York. 1927. 260 pages.

L. C. Douglas, the pastor of First Congregational Church of Los Angeles, has lately (in the "Christian Century") explained to us the reason of the "Seeming Impotence of Christianity." Christianity is unable to influence the general character and conduct of the people because it wastes time on metaphysical speculations (the Trinity, nature and origin of Jesus, probably) and is burdened with an outworn atonement theory based on the sacrificial system of Judaism ("the churches have always seemed at their best when conducting a funeral over the mangled remains of their crucified Christ"). If they would rather learn from Jesus, who lived entirely *unafraid of God,* the right conception of the deity, the kinetic energies would be released to enable them to serve the public as power-houses for the transmission of a tremendous moral energy. If they, however, prefer the mere sentimentalities of mysticism, the world will soon look for other agencies for making real and practical the power of God to motivate the soul.

These views, although not at all original, may prepare us for the rather radical treatment of the subject Mr. Douglas discusses in this book. He sets out by saying that all great facts have come to us through a process of gradual relief from superstition. Astronomy has evolved from astrology, chemistry from alchemy; and because we have arrived at the well authenticated facts of science it behooves us by no means to look down with contempt on the guesses of a prescientific age. The same law applies to religion, to our own religion as well as to all religion. The Bible is the record of the spiritual evolution of a great race. No one who is acquainted with the facts and not hampered by an untenable view of inspiration, will deny that the God-consciousness of the Old Testament writers shows a gradual rise from the lower to the higher. The "Jovian caprice and Jehovistic impetuosity of the God of the early seers are in time eliminated in the interest of a steady and law-loving God." The ancient Jehovah religion was "evolved by shepherds, socially restricted, economically enslaved, and enisled against the broadening contacts with the outside world." When environments and conditions changed and widened, ideas would naturally follow. Even the New Testament does not bring us to the end of the process. The apostle Paul believed in the speedy end of the world. No wonder he was not interested in the art and philosophy of Greece or in the betterment of institutions of his age. To think that the leaders of Israel or the Church were the interpreters of the infallible oracles

of the deity, is to have a wrong view of revelation. God revealed himself not only then and there, he reveals himself to us the same as to them. The honest seeker always finds him. It seems that in our scientific age God's dealings with men will be determined by the test tube and the blow pipe rather than by the surplice and chalice. "The Bunsen burner will in the future be as potent as the censer in the past." Humanity will free itself from physical inhibitions and mental adhesions by the use of all kinds of scientific methods.

To us moderns, believing as we do in the continuity of natural law, the miraculous element in the Bible proves a stumbling block. We know that miracles, miracles in the ordinary sense of the word, don't happen today, and cannot see how they could have happened then. God is the same and nature is the same, why, then, should divine action have been different in Bible times than it is now? And even granting that the Bible miracles were genuine, what benefit would they be to us when we are sure we can't count on them at this time? The author is chiefly interested in the miracles of Jesus, but he discusses some found in the Old Testament. He himself does not believe in miracles. He says, "the history of the Hebrew race is draped in the graceful folds of the mantle of legend." To him, therefore, the miracles recorded are natural events which have been "embellished by the minstrel." The poets of the nation are the creators of these beautiful myths, even as Homer idealized for the Greeks their past and the lives of their fabulous heroes.

Nevertheless, he is by no means minded to relegate the whole religious contribution of the Hebrews to a subordinate place. The conception of deity among the Hebrews, he says, so early, is so far in advance of the ideas of the time that it is a great problem to account for it on any ordinary principle.

Coming to the miracles predicated of or about Jesus, the writer sees in the miracle stories everywhere the embellished activity of poetic fancy, spoken of above. He dissolves them all into allegories, pictorial representations of moral or spiritual ideas. The infancy stories, e. g., have only impressional, no historical value; that is, they give the impression of the writer in poetic, dramatic form. One might say, with Ritschl, they express judgments of value, not of fact; they have revelation worth, not scientific. Did the angels ever sing in Bethlehem's fields? No, they sang only in the hearts of the believers. To the believers it was the same as though they had actually sung.

In explaining the story of the temptations of Jesus, he says, the first one is the decisive one. Jesus made the test whether the real man is his soul or his body; whether the man as a soul, a son of God, would command the body, was in command of his life. Jesus came through this test victorious, with the exultant faith that now, having won in the battle, he could do everything; that he was "the master of his soul and the captain of his fate." His gospel is henceforth that man, living by the spiritual energies communicated by the omnipotent God, has the source of happiness and power in contact with the father. In the miracle of Cana, the first one according to John, the evangelist

wrote a poem. It contains the lesson of the transforming presence of Jesus. With Jesus there, it was as if the water they drank was wine. The stilling of the storm is the dramatic telling of the fact that nothing can ever upset the equilibrium in the disciples' minds. What would be the use, he asks, of Jesus stilling the storm once, at that particular time? He doesn't do it now. He saves men *in* storms, not *from* them. He is no magician, to astound and mystify. The feeding of the 5000 is no miracle of multiplying. Jesus took the boy's loaves and thanked God for his blessings and for the willingness to share them with others, and his example and spirit evoked the same willingness in the multitude. They produced what they had brought, shared it with those who had not, and everyone had a plentiful meal. In the healing of the blind, again, we have that same pictorial form of telling a spiritual truth, that Jesus is the light of the world. The resurrection of Jesus does not imply the revivifying of his dead body, but that his spirit, his gospel and his influence continue.

We do not believe that this attempt to make the miracles of Jesus less disturbing will convince anybody. It is the same method that the Rationalists employed 150 years ago; the same path followed by Strauss, Paulus (Heidelberg), and a host of others, later. It is undertaken on the assumption that miracles do not and cannot happen. But be that as it may, no candid reader of the gospels will get the impression that the gospel writers themselves did not hand these stories down as miracles. If, e. g., the feeding of the 5000 was nothing but what Mr. Douglas says, why, then, was the excitement aroused so great that they wanted to make him king, as John says? Why was the story told by all four gospel writers if it contained nothing but a manifestation of the good-heartedness dormant in human nature?

And as for the "embellishment of the minstrels" which the author detects everywhere, some of the gospels were written about 30 years after Jesus' death. At that time the minstrels had had no time to spin there fantastic tales. There were eye-witnesses enough, and honest men enough, to contradict any attempt to falsify the record of Jesus' life.

Finally, if miracles don't happen in the physical sphere, how can we account for the moral and spiritual miracle of Christ's person and message? The one denial leads of necessity to the denial of the other. To the author Jesus is the man who, having won a spiritual conflict in his own soul, teaches others to do the same. He is the interpreter of the Christian way of living, which embraces the two principles of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. But that, although implied in his message, was not his gospel. His gospel was that salvation from sin comes to mankind in his death and resurrection. The Christian religion was essentially a Saviour-religion. With that the apostles went out, on that the church was founded, and with it they conquered the world. This gospel the author repudiates. His non-miraculous position makes him unfit to be an expounder of the miracles of Jesus, and still more to grasp the meaning of his lifework and person.

If one believes in Christ as the bringer of salvation to the race, he has no difficulty in believing that such a man could do miracles. The authority of his person is to him the guarantee of the genuineness of his works.

It is true miracles of that sort don't happen now; and that, therefore, in preaching about his miracles we have to employ largely the symbolical method in the application. But in doing this, we do not dissolve the miracles themselves in parabolical poems. They are to us a manifestation of the divine sympathy of the master and his power over sin, disease, death, nature, which power he puts at the disposal of the believer when he sees himself face to face with the evils of life.

Transition. A Sentimental Story of One Mind and One Era, by *Will Durant*. Simon and Schuster, New York. 1927. 352 pages.

The author of the *Story of Philosophy* here shows the "effect, upon one growing mind, of the profound transformation which modern science and research have brought in the faith of the western world." The story seems wholly autobiographical. He calls his hero John Lemaire, but John is doubtless Will Durant himself. Of course, we don't know how far he has, with poetic license, embellished the story in detail, but the essential features delineate his own experience. The "Transition" which the author describes is the passing of the son of a devout Catholic family from faith to skepticism. He becomes acquainted with modern critical science and turns his back upon the dogmas of an authoritative church.

He calls it a "sentimental" story for his breaking away from mother church entailed much suffering upon his parents and, incidentally, upon himself.

John Lemaire was the son of French-Canadian parents. Endowed with unusual gifts, he had been induced by the priest and his own pious parents to study for the priesthood. Being himself without any pronounced religious bent, this step was bound to have disastrous consequences. While in the academy already, he had secretly read many books considered dangerous for the loyal Catholic. But when he became acquainted with Darwin the bottom dropped out of the slender faith he still had. He felt that it was hypocrisy for him to enter the seminary, but the fear to break his mother's heart prevailed with him. The two years in the seminary were naturally years of bondage, he realized he was living a lie. At last he summoned enough energy to cut the knot. He fell in with a group of anarchists and one evening, in a mood of bravado, gave a lecture in which he claimed that religion originated in sex worship. When the bishop of the diocese heard of it he excommunicated him, and this action was published in the newspapers. His father and mother were heartbroken. The chapter in which the author describes the devastating effect the bishop's step had on the mind of the devout and loving mother, is the most touching in the whole book.

His father turned him out of the house. His existence was for a time of a very precarious nature until a benefactor, Mr. Alden (the Mr.

Alden Freeman whom Durant mentions in the preface to "the Story of Philosophy"), whom he had met in his connection with the "Radicals," gave him the means for travel in Europe and, later, to study four years in Columbia University. Soon after his return he fell in love with a 14 year-old girl, born in a Russian Ghetto, who had just immigrated to America. He married her a few months later and she not only became his beloved wife but also the companion of his studies.

The World War breaks out and he comes under the influence of Mr. Wilson and his ideals, for a while, but with the peace disillusionment begins and he sees, as never before, that the world cannot be bettered by violence and slaughter.

He had for a long time, politically, been a pupil of Marx; the Socialists seemed to be the only party that had a thoroughgoing scheme for the economic salvation of the world. Still he noticed that even Socialists when becoming prosperous, left the cause of Labor and joined the propertied class. What was the use to run after utopias? Was it not better to be satisfied with what was possible than to demand the whole loaf? He decided to throw in his lot with the Liberals, the open-minded, the practical politicians, the believers (and beneficiaries) of Science.

We see John Lemaire, or W. Durant, holds his faiths lightly, they are no life and death matters to him. He is no crusader; he does not stick to his ideals through thick and thin. Defeat discourages him, it makes him sad and skeptical but he has no desire to reach for the martyr's crown. When a child is born to him and he feels the joys of parenthood, hope begins to revive in him. The family, he argues, is after all closer to us than the state. The race will live even if the individual dies; our children will carry on the work of the fathers, we shall live in them. It is a beautiful chapter in which he describes the birth of his child and the effect it had on his dampened spirit. But it seems rather a small consolation for a man who has lost his faith in God and in society, to say, "have I not a beloved child in my arms?" The child later brings about a reconciliation with the old parents.

It is an interesting book. The author has a wonderfully facile pen, he seems to write with astonishing ease. One thing we don't like about the book is the gratuitous frankness of his love stories. He has quite a few of them and tells us exactly how far he, or they, went, as though he had taken J. J. Rousseau for his pattern. Does he want us to know what a devil of a fellow he was? He certainly tells them with keen relish.

He had left the Catholic church and the priesthood but he speaks many a good word for the priests. With few exceptions they are all pure because the sexual instinct was suppressed in them through the severe discipline of the seminary; and they are nearly all sincere believers because in the formative years of their life faith was so systematically ingrained in them that it became a habit. The author's own example does not seem to support these conclusions, but then with him skepticism and sex offered too much of a resistance to the methods of the seminary. Will Durant, in his "transition," lost his church and

faith and exchanged science for it. His gifts enabled him to achieve comparative wealth and considerable fame, in addition to his domestic happiness. With these things in his possession, he finds that the sun shines on his path again. Still, wealth and fame alone won't satisfy very long, and our children may die before us or may disappoint us. Therefore happiness built on these factors is insecure. It seems the part of wisdom then to build on a more stable foundation, and where is there one unless it be in some "cosmic" support?

Religious Thought in the Last Quarter Century, by *J. M. Powis Smith, Shirley Jackson Case, Harold R. Willoughby, John Thomas McNeill, Gerald Birney Smith, Edward L. Schaub, A. Eustace Hayden, Theodore G. Soares, Ozora S. Davis, Archibald G. Baker,* and *Shailer Mathews.* Edited by *G. B. Smith.* The University of Chicago Press, 1927. 239 pages.

This book containing articles by eleven writers which appeared first in the "Journal of Religion" (in 1926) surveys the progress of theological scholarship during the quarter-century just ended.

The first article is on *Old Testament Interpretation,* by *J. M. Powis Smith.* The history of Old Testament Criticism is briefly told, especially that of the Pentateuch. The critical study of the Old Testament will in the future be less concerned with the text or with the age and the relations of the various documents. The approach to the writers will be from the psychological viewpoint. The student will try to understand them and their message from the time and circumstances in which they lived. In the same way, the religion of the Hebrews in general will not be considered as a mere product of divine revelation. It will be studied in connection with the religions of other peoples which influenced Hebrew history. The Canaanites, the Assyrians, Babylonians and, particularly, Egypt, have all in turn played a vital part in the shaping of Israel's fate and have been essential factors in its religious development. As Israel's geographical horizon widened, so did its faith. In many respects the Jews have also borrowed from other nations, but it must be admitted that whatever they borrowed they enriched and refined.

The *Life of Jesus* is treated by *Shirley Jackson Case.* In the past the life of Jesus used to be studied with the principal motive of edification. Jesus was to be presented as the fitting object of adoration. Or, if more scholarly work was done, there was always an apologetic purpose in the mind of the writer. Certain doctrines, such as the trinity, the two natures of Christ, the miracles, etc., were to be defended, and it had to be shown that they were in the record and that the record was reliable. Again, personal bias played its part. Whatever interest was paramount in the mind of the biographers he projected into the life of Jesus. Jesus was the social reformer, the pacifist, the Y. M. C. A. worker, the typical modern hustler. (Bruce Barton.)

According to Case the person and life of Jesus must be studied impartially, with no preconceived ideas. The student ought to divest himself of all dogmatic prejudice. He ought to see him as a son of his

time; he ought to study the Jewish sources and learn to understand the sociological environment in which Jesus grew up and lived. Only so can he come close to the facts.

Case has done this himself in his "New Biography of Jesus." With what disastrous consequences, we have tried to show in the B. R. of the March number, p. 150 ff.

After a "Study of Early Christianity" by Willoughby and an "Interpretation of Protestantism" by McNeill, the editor himself writes on *Theological Thinking in America.*

Theology has for centuries professed truths which are divinely authorized. The source of that authority has been located in the Bible. Modern scholarship has shown that the Bible cannot be used as such a court of last appeal. Some of the doctrines of the Christian creed arose later than the Bible, for instance the metaphysical conception of the Trinity. Some are denied by the new science, such as the creation of man, the fall of Adam and its consequences; some are in contradiction to the nature of God as revealed by Christ, such as the doctrine of hell and everlasting punishment.

Modern scholarship, therefore, is learning to be less concerned about the Bible as such. Miracles are a stumbling block to the modern theologian. He recognizes a large admixture of legend all through the biblical record. Instead of using the Bible text as authoritative, as it stands, he rather bases his claims on spiritual experience. What cannot be thus experienced is of no value to the man of today. With this criterion in application, angels, eschatology, the Trinity, the two natures, the doctrine of sin and salvation, the Christologies cease to be of present interest, they reflect the religious notions of past ages.

Modern science is building up a culture that does not need the support of religion. Our very conception of the Deity may have to be revised as a result of the scientific study of the world and of history. We are not in a position to give more than a tentative formulation as yet, but the contributions from science to this all-important subject may be far-reaching.

Mr. Smith has followed a similar line of reasoning in his "Current Christian Thinking." See our discussion of it in B. R., July number, p. 318.

That by giving up the Bible as a source of authority Protestantism would give up itself goes without saying. The abandoning of the verbal inspiration of the Bible by no means robs it of its supreme position. It may not be so easy to show how far the authority of the Bible goes in detail, but Christ's revelation of God the father and of salvation in him and him only, are irreducible elements. There are chapters on the Psychology of Religion in the book; on History of Religions; Religious Education; American Preaching; Foreign Missions; and Social Christianity. The position of the writers is that of the Liberal school and perhaps mostly the left wing of that school. Still they are all able contributions, covering the field with reasonable fulness. It is a book not only good to read but also to have. The bibliography given on each subject is a valuable feature.

For reference purposes the book fills a useful place.

Preaching Values in New Translations of the New Testament, by *Halford E. Luccock*. The Abingdon Press, 1928. 312 pages. $2.00.

This volume contains the "high spots" of the three modern translations of the New Testament, those by Moffatt, Weymouth and Goodspeed. "It presents more than 150 of the most striking and arresting texts which bring new ideas and fresh insights not found in the more familiar words of the King James and Revised Versions. With each text there are a few paragraphs of brief, pointed, incisive comment, showing how these new and vivid renderings of the words of the New Testament may be put to the service of winning an eager hearing for New Testament truth. Original, fertile in inventions, stimulating to the imagination, these chapters will provide suggestive starting points for fresh thinking."

To give a few illustrations Matt. 11: 6 is translated by Goodspeed: "Blessed is the man who finds nothing that *repels* him in me." This furnishes the title, "The Repellent Christ," and it is pointed out that today many are repelled by him on account of: 1) the spirit of acquisition so dominant a force in life, 2) the modern love of comfort, 3) the moral austerity in Christ, 4) self-assertive nationalism. Or, Luke 7: 30: "The . . . *experts* in the law thwarted God's purpose for themselves." (Goodspeed.) Here the mistakes of the different experts may be shown up: the psychological expert (J. Watson: "the soul is a relic of an outworn psychology"); the anthropological expert ("the Nordic races are superior to all others"); the military expert, etc. Emerson Fosdick had a review of the book in a recent number of the "Christian Century." It was entitled "Priming the Preacher's Pump." A very apt metaphor, for, indeed, if the preacher is out for fresh subjects or for such comment as will start his mental processes into new activity, he finds here the kind that for suggestiveness is hard to surpass.

Does Civilization Need Religion? By *Reinhold Niebuhr*. The Macmillan Company, 1928. $2.00.

We have seen two very favorable, although brief reviews of this first venture of our fellow-Synodical, one in "The Christian Century" and one in the "Federal Council Bulletin." During this year's "Pastors' Convention" at Columbus, just over, it occupied a prominent place on the book stand, sold like the proverbial hot cakes, and was a source of pride to the members of the Synod, especially the younger set.

We regret that we are not able to discuss it in this issue. We anticipate great profit and enjoyment from its study and shall review it (s. c. J.) in the May Number (see p. 234, ff).

Rough-Hewed and Other Sermons, by *Raymond L. Forman*. The Abingdon Press. 1927. 211 pages, $1.50. Eighteen sermons by the pastor of St. Paul's Methodist Church, of New York City. There is in them "full evidence of intellectual vigor, scholarly instinct, spiritual discernment, and moral earnestness."

Parenthood and the Character Training of Children, by *Thomas Walton Galloway, Ph.D.*, Associate Director Department of Educational Measures, American Social Hygiene Association. The Methodist Book Concern, 1927. 224 pages, $1.00.

"This book is designed to introduce parents to the task of building up sound character and conduct, and to help them to pass on to their children the best they know and feel. It undertakes to help anxious parents to see their duty clearly and to perform it without embarrassment and with intelligence."

Light for the Dark Hours of Life, published once a month by the Association for City Missions of the Evangelical Churches of St. Louis. Thirty cents per year; 100 copies or more 20c each per year.

The four-page pamphlet contains a prayer, Scripture passage, song and comment, all selected with a view to console the sick and afflicted. Can be used with profit in hospitals; the patients enjoy it.

God, the Great Poet, Man, the Great Poem, by *Bruce S. Wright.* The Abingdon Press, 1928. 196 pages, $1.25.

Paul says in Ephesians 2, 10: We are his workmanship, poiema. Because poiema (work, product of work) gradually came to mean "poem" also, the author conceived the idea that man is, in a real sense, a poem, God's poem. He finds himself in accord with Longfellow who says:

"For what are all our contrivings,
And the wisdom of our books,
When compared with your caresses
And the gladness of your looks?
"Ye are better than all the ballads
That ever were sung or said;
For ye are *living poems,*
And all the rest are dead."

This thought of man's being God's poem holds all the sermons of the book together. The writer carries it out like this: "The Trend of the Poem" (speaking of Hopeful Tendencies in Present Day Religion); "The Poem Marches" (Progress pictured in the world); "The Poem has Polish" (Adornment of the Doctrine); "The Poem's Rhythm" (I Love a River); "Poems Young and Old" (The A. C. D. of Youth and Age); "The Poem's Chimax" (Praise, Peace and a Program) etc. The sermons are helpful, practical and interesting. The underlying idea, however, seems to us too fanciful, too artificial to carry the weight attached to it. Man is without a doubt the product of the creative spirit; but he is only in a very limited sense a poem, and the author undertook too much when he tried to develop that one theme in 18 variations.

VOLUME 56. NOVEMBER 1928. NUMBER 6.

Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America

Motto: 1. *Cor.* 3, 22-23.
Πάντα ὑμῶν ἐστίν, ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ.

Published bi-monthly and entered at the post office at St. Louis, Mo., as second-class matter in December, 1898.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October, 1917, authorized on July 3, 1918.

CONTENTS

PAGE

Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per year (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 9807 Cudell Ave., Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-18 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

VOL. 56. ST. LOUIS, MO. NOVEMBER 1928.

THE BLAVATSKY-BESANT CULT

By Armin Haeussler

Among the many grotesque and bizarre cults which have arisen in our day, none is more unique than the theosophic group. Theosophists claim to have elaborated a synthesis of all religious, philosophical, and scientific systems. Although the postulates of Plato and Sankara, of animism and Christianity, and of Voliva and Einstein, in the fields of philosophy, religion, and natural science, respectively, are hopelessly incompatible, we are told that all systems have least-common-denominator elements, which form the irreducible minimum of the so-called "Wisdom Religion" of all the ages. A system so inclusive theoretically transcends all barriers of race, place, and time. In a day in which parochialism is becoming more and more out of date, it is quite natural that a system representing a seeming urbanity *in excelsis* should arouse a considerable amount of sympathetic interest. Since it stresses comparative religion, comparative history, comparative philology, and other "comparatives," it has arrested the attention of those who believe that non-Christian peoples have not been given due credit for past achievements. Christian scholars who are used to the scientific method have concluded that Theosophists are scientific after a fashion, but unscientific after more than a fashion; nevertheless, they feel that some credit is due this cult for stimulating interest in the literary deposits and religious history of the East, which gave to the world all its great religions and is now beginning to reinterpret Christ and the Christlike life from the viewpoint of the Orient.

Beginnings

Modern theosophy had its inception in a spiritualistic-occult milieu. Helen Petrovna Blavatsky, nee Hahn, the founder, born in Russia in 1831 of German and Russian parentage, showed an inordinate interest throughout life in spiritualistic phenomena, and was a medium herself from the days of her childhood. After her marriage to an old Russian general, N. V. Blatvatsky, at the age of seventeen, whom she deserted after three months, her life became almost a closed book for the next twenty-four years (1848-1872). Two facts, however, are revealed by letters: first, that she traveled in many countries, returning to Russia in 1858; second, that during these decades she lead a wild and dissolute life, a fact which she later admitted in a series of letters to Solovyoff, and which he later published in his volume entitled *A Modern Priestess of Isis.* One of these letters which was written in February, 1886, reads in part as follows: "I have already written a letter to Sinnett *forbidding him* to publish my memoirs at his own discretion. I myself will publish them with all the truth about H. P. Blavatsky, in which psychology and *her* own and *others'* immorality and Rome and politics and all *her own* and *others'* filth once more will be set out to God's world. I shall conceal nothing. It will be a saturnalia of the moral depravity of mankind, this *confession* of mine, a worthy epilogue of my stormy life."[1]

Growing tired of Russia and of one Metrovich with whom she had been co-habiting for several years, she departed for Cairo, Egypt in 1872 where she continued to hold seances. From 1873 to 1878 she resided in New York, the American public being at the time greatly interested in spiritualism. A newspaper man, named Col. Henry Steel Olcott, introduced Madame Blavatsky as a Russian countess and a world traveler of the Livingstone type. The sale of his book, *People From Another World,* came to an abrupt standstill, however, when the public showed unmistakable signs of indignation over frauds at seances. Some new snell-hook had to be devised for a more or less gullible public, as Madame Blavatsky declared with brusque candor.[2]

In this setting the Theosophical Society had its inception. It was organized on Sept. 7, 1875 in the rooms of Madame Blavatsky at 46 Irving Place, New York. Olcott was chosen president, W. Q. Judge, vice-president, and Madame Blavatsky, corresponding secretary. Concerning the nature of the society, Madame Blavatsky wrote to Solovyoff a few days later as follows: "It will be composed of learned occultists and cabbalists, of philosophes Herme-

[1] *A Modern Priestess of Isis,* by V. S. Solovyoff, translated by Walter Leaf. Longmans, London, 1895; p. 181.

[2] Solovyoff, *op. cit.,* p. 253.

tiques of the nineteenth century, and of passionate antiquaries and Egyptologists generally." A few months later she wrote that it was "the same spiritualism, but under another name."[3]

"Theosophy" in 1877

The two subsequent years were devoted by Madame Blavatsky to her work, *Isis Unveiled,* two bulky volumes, one on science and the other on theology, which came off the press on October 2, 1877. At that time the background of modern theosophy was Egypt, as, indeed, the title would indicate. While Christianity is damned with faint praise in present-day theosophical writings, we find it subjected to a violent frontal attack in *Isis Unveiled.* Science also is attacked. It is very embarrassing to Theosophists to find no mention or approval of some of the leading doctrines of theosophy in this work, as may be seen from the following comparison:

Present-day theosophy	*Isis Unveiled*
Karma	No karma
Reincarnation	No reincarnation
Doctrine of brotherhood	No doctrine of brotherhood
Man a seven-fold being	Man a three-fold being

Coleman's Analysis

No scholar studied this work more intensively and analytically than William Emmette Coleman. As a result of his painstaking labors, it was discovered that large sections of it were taken bodily from about one hundred books. The following summary gives the source of many of the plagiarizations:

Name of book	Number of passages
Dunlap's *Sod: the Son of Man*	134
Ennemoser's *History of Magic* (English translation)	107
Demonologia	85
Dunlap's *Spirit History of Man*	77
Salverti's *Philosophy of Magic* (English translation)	68
Dundap's *Sod: the Mysteries of Adonis*	65
Des Mousseaux's *Magie au Dixneuvième Siècle*	63
King's *Gnostics,* first edition	42
Supernatural Religion	40
Mackenzie's *Masonic Cyclopedia*	36
Zeller's *Plato and the Old Academy*	35

Isis Unveiled is a peculiar hodge-podge, a mixture of the oc-

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 265.

[4] *Modern Religious Movements in India,* by J. N. Farquhar. Macmillan, N. Y., 1915, p. 224.

cultism of antiquity—Persian, Egyptian, Chaldean, Hebrew, and that of the Greek mysteries, plus the Hebrew-Christian esoterism of the Essenes, the Gnostics, the Neoplatonics, the Neopythagoreans, and the cabbalists of the Middle Ages.

From New York to Bombay

In the meantime public opinion had become increasingly hostile to spiritualism, and especially so after the publication of Home's Lights and Shadows of Spiritualism, which exposed Madame Blavatsky's frauds. She thereupon decided to leave the country, writing in December, 1877: "It is for this that I am going forever to India, and for shame and vexation I want to go where no one will know my name."[5] A divorce was obtained from an Amenian named Michael Bettalay, whom she had married on April 3, 1875, although she was at the time still the legal wife of Gen. Blavatsky.

Col. Olcott left his wife and children, joining Madame Blavatsky on her journey to India, where the two, called the "Theosophical Twins," arrived in January, 1879. Bombay now became the seat of the Theosophical Society. For a short period they were on a friendly footing with Swami Dayanandi Sarasvati, who had founded the Arya Samaj; however, their friendship finally ended in an angry parting, Olcott calling this authority on the Vedas a humbug, the latter replying that Olcott and Madame Blavatsky were deceivers and charlatans.[6]

The Theosophical Myth

Since India is the home of theosophic speculation, one need not be surprised that the Theosophical Society finally began to lay in a stock of theosophic ideas. The theosophical system as we know it today was really pieced together after Madame Blavatsky's death. Her fabrication known as the theosophical myth, however, has remained essentially as she originally proclaimed it. According to this super-fairy-tale Tibet is the seat of a so-called Brotherhood of the Great White Lodge, a hierarchy composed of *Uebermenschen, arhats* (called adepts in the Occident), and initiates, who possesses all knowledge and have the liberty to mediate it to others. They have shaken off the law of karma, and have the power to reveal how one may get beyond the clutches of death and reincarnation. This is done by apprentices who do the bidding of their invisible masters, whom they reverently call Mahatmas, that is, great souls. The pupils will in the course of time become *arhats* themselves. In this stage of the world's history, Madame Blavatsky is the one individual most worthy of serving an apprenticeship

[5] Solovyoff, *op. cit.*, p. 278.

[6] *Old Diary Leaves*, by H. S. Olcott, Putnam's Sons, N. Y., four volumes, I, pp. 394-407. *Die indische Theosophie*, Speyer, pp. 315 ff.

to the Masters. The task of training and instructing her was delegated to one Mahatma Morya, with Mahatma Koot Hoomi and others serving as assistant trainers. She claims that she first met Mahatma Morya, "the Master of her dreams," in 1851. Strangely enough, while living in New York she had a different intimate, the disembodied spirit of one John King. From 1851 until the appearance of the myth she never mentioned her Tibetan confidant.

The Hodgson Investigation

When the headquarters of the society were removed to Adyar, near Madras, in December, 1882, a special room in Madame Blavatsky's bungalow was reserved for the carrying out of phenomena, a corner of it being curtained off to serve as a shrine to the Mahatmas. The phenomena were of such a nature that the London Society for Psychical Research sent Mr. Richard Hodgson of Oxford to investigate. While on his way to India, *The Madras Christian College Magazine* published sections of letters written by Madame Blavatsky which contained instructions in regard to the production of phenomena. These letters had been sent to a Theosophist, Madame Coulomb, an intimate friend and member of her personal staff. Madame Coulomb had helped to produce fraudulent phenomena, but upon deciding to leave the society, went to the office of the above magazine and handed over the incriminating letters. Although a number of very damaging passages regarding clandestine meetings of Madame Blavatsky with Hindus and government officials remained unpublished, the theosophists blustered and raged furiously and talked of bringing suit against the missionaries. Since Olcott, Sinnett, and others feared that their cause might be damaged beyond repair in case Madame Blavatsky were placed on the witness stand, the idea of a suit was finally dropped.

Hodgson gave a voluminous report on this investigations, which Farquahar summarizes as follows: ". . . Every phenomenon, so far as he had been able to trace it, was fraudulent; . . . the letters handed over by Madame Coulomb were genuine; . . . most of the Koot Hoomi letters were written by Madame Blavatsky herself, though a few were probably written by Damodar" (a sercant).[7]

When the Theosophists began to defame Madame Coulomb, she threatened to bring suit against them, whereupon (April 2, 1885) Madame Blavatsky left Madras for Europe never again to return to India. Damodar, Judge, Hartmann, and other members of the inner circle of the society also left in quick succession. Six years later the founder died.

---

[7] Farquhar, *op. cit.*, p. 251.

Developments Since Blavatsky's Death

For a short time after her death Judge acted as president of the society, producing papers from Mahatma Morya commissioning him to assume this office. Many Theosophists believed they were forged and demanded an investigation. When this was refused W. R. Gorn Old, an official, and others seceded from the society. Mrs. Besant had burned all incriminating documents, just as Judge had in 1884 removed the shrine from Madame Blavatsky's bungalow and burned it. However, photostatic copies of Judge's papers had been taken, and were published along with an illuminating article in *The Westminster Gazette,* October 29-November 8, 1894 by Edmund Garrett, and reissued in book form later under the title *Isis Very Much Unveiled.* Judge left the society, forming a new one in America which he named The Universal Brotherhood and Theosophical Society. He died eleven months later. Katherine Tingley is the present head of this group which has its headquarters in Point Loma, California.

Mrs. Annie Besant has been president of the parent body since 1907. She was at one time the wife of a Anglican clergyman, whom she left after becoming an atheist. Madame Blavatsky's book, *The Secret Doctrine,* made such an impression on her that she was converted to theosophy in 1888.

Mr. C. W. Leadbeater became identified with the movement in 1884 after having served for a short period as a curate in the Anglican church. His immoral connections with Krishnamurti caused his expulsion from the society for almost four years. To the great surprise of other Theosophists he was reinstated by Mrs. Besant, although no repudiation of his immoral teachings or practices had preceded his reinstatement. Mrs. Besant declared that theosophy had nothing to do with morality, adding in almost the same breath that Leadbeater was almost an exalted being, "on the threshhold of divinity!" Mr. G. R. S. Mead and seven hundred English theosophists hereupon withdrew from the society in disgust and formed a new organization, which is known as The Quest. Shortly before the war Rudolf Steiner, a leading German theosophist, and the majority of German lodges withdrew after protesting vainly gainst the Alcyone or Krishnamurti cult, and formed Die anthroposophische Gesellschaft.

Among those who have left the Theosophical Society to become Christians is a Madame E. R. McNeile, whose book *From Theosophy to Christian Faith* is a valuable work, since we find here not merely what the society teaches in public, but also what is taught in the Esoteric School, or the inner circle of the initiates.

The System Today

The Theosophical Society exists, as its members affirm, for a three-fold purpose:

1. To establish the nucleus of a universal brotherhood without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste, or color.
2. To promote the study of Aryan and other religions, literatures and sciences.
3. To investigate unexplained laws of nature and the psychical powers latent in man.

Investigation naturally implies the acceptance of the scientific method, but theosophical writers appear to have little use for such procedure. Their transcendental astronomy and chemistry remind one much of medieval astrology and alchemy. No shred of real evidence is submitted to prove the reality of "akashic records," "etheric doubles," and the like. Madame McNeile writes: "The whole mass of teaching is a collection of *ipse dixits* utterly unsubstantiated, frequently contradictory of known scientific results, and offering no means of verification.[8]

Theosophy is not a science but an electric religion. "Theosophy postulates an eternal principle called the unknown, which can never be recognized save through its manifestations. This principle is identified with every thing and being." It comes and goes in regular cycles like Halley's comet.

The Seven Planes

It is composed of "spirit-matter," which is "stepped down" from fineness to coarseness through a series of seven veils or planes differing not in kind, but in degree. This septenary nature of the universe is shared by man. The seven aspects of his being appear in two groups: the *quarternary,* the mortal part of man, and the *triad,* his spiritual side. The following planes are in the two groups:

Quarternary

1. Sthula sharira: the animal body.
2. Prana vital energy.
3. Linga sharira: the astral body, or astral double.
4. Kama: passional nature, or the animal soul.

Triad

1. Manas: intellect, or devachanic body, the real I.
2. Buddhi: the spiritual soul, or Buddhic plane.
3. Atman: spirit, or the Nirvanic plane,—the One Eternal Existence.

---

[8] "Truth and Error in Theosophy," *The East and the West,* XII (1914), p. 53.

The whole scheme differs from one elaborated by Paracelsus only in its terminology:

Paracelsus	*Blavatsky*
1. The animal body.	1. Rupa: the animal body.
2. Prana: vital energy.	2. Jiva: vital energy.
3. The sidereal body.	3. Linga sharira: the astral body.
4. The animal soul.	4. Kama rupa: the animal soul.
5. The rational soul (intellect).	5. Manas: intellect.
6. The spiritual soul.	6. Buddhi: the spiritual soul.
7. The man of the new Olympus.	7. Atman: spirit.[9]

Madame Blavatsky thus assembled and reconstructed the Paracelsus skeleton, modestly ascribing the work, however, to Mahatma Morya, Mahatma Koot Hoomi, and the other masters. Rather than call her a plagiarist, why not classify her as an occult palaeontologist in this instance? These seven planes have nothing in common with Indian theosophy. The names have given them an Indian tinge and invested them with an air of the mystical. Authorities in Sanskrit point out the absurd meanings which have been attached to some of these terms. For instance, the Sanskrit word *kamarupa* is either an adjective, meaning "changing his form in accordance with choice," or a proper noun, the Sanskrit designation of the land Annam.[10]

Karma and Reincarnation

"Karma literally means action, and covers every action in the universe, involving an unbroken sequence of cause and effect. The conditions in which an individual finds himself have been determined for him by his previous existences. Thus all disparity of conditions is due to karma, an inexorable and pitiless law. Inquisitors, according to Mrs. Besant, are born again deformed, so why should anyone pity them? They are getting exactly what they deserve. Logically one need not help the weak and the sinful, although Mrs. Besant probably would not put it as bluntly as that. By inference, however, she states that it is useless to attempt to teach the savage. She says: "The great difference between our child and that of the savage is that ours answers to a moral teaching or ideal where it is put before him, and the child of the savage does not." The best answer to such a sweeping assertion may be found in Darwin's statement to the effect that the missionary's message is the magician's wand because of the difference which that message makes. Theosophists claim that one of their great

[9] Speyer, *op. cit.*, p. 319.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 320.

objectives is the establishment of world brotherhood, yet they preach the doctrine of karma which gives to the caste system, the very antithesis of the brotherhood ideal of Christianity, an indelible character.

The doctrine of reincarnation is the necessary corollary of the doctrine of karma. No orthodox Hindu has ever attempted to state dogmatically how often one may be reborn. It has remained for Sinnett to do that. Man is reborn, he says, at least 686 times, while the maximum number of rebirths probably does not exceed 800 times. How does he arrive at the first figure? 686 is 343 x 2, and 343, again, is the cube of 7, which is regarded as a holy number.

A New Ethnography

Theosophists have constructed a new framework of ethmography. Mankind may be divided historically speaking, into great "root races." We belong to the fifth sub-race of the fifth root race. A sixth root race is now come into being on the western slopes of the North American continent and in Australia. Every root race is guided by a great Teacher, appearing in reincarnate form to every sub-race. To the extinct race which once lived on the shores of the Mediterranean he came as Hermes; to the Iranians as Zoroaster; to the Latins, Greeks and Celts (the fourth sub-race) as Orpheus. He became incarnate for the last time as Gautama Siddhartha, and through his last initiation became Buddha, "the Enlightened One." The Teutonic sub-race was taught by Christ, who used the body of Jesus of Nazareth, one of his disciples.

Jesus Christ

Theosophists maintain that Jesus was born 105 B.C. and that he received his religious training from the Koinobioi in Egypt and an Essene community in the desert in Southern Judea. At the age of nineteen he went to the Essene monastery at Mt. Serbal, where "a magnificent library of occult works—many of them Indian of the Trans-Himalayan regions—had been established." He was taught the "secret doctrine," and was "initiated in Egypt as the disciple of that one sublime lodge from which every great religion has its founder."[12]

Leadbeater goes to great lengths to prove that the Roman governor Pontius Pilate is not referred to in the Apostolic Creed, but is the expression "póntos piltós," which would "simply mean a compressed or densified sea—by no means a bad description of the lower part of the astral plane, which is so constantly typified by water. The clause usually translated 'suffered under Pontius Pi-

[11] *Ibid.*, 319.

[12] *A Comparison Between Christianity and Theosophy*, by Fraser, pp. 22 f.

late' should be rendered, 'He endured the dense sea,' that is to say, for us men and our salvation, he allowed himself to be for the time limited by, and imprisoned in astral matter."[13]

KRISHNAMURTI

The Teacher of the new root race will use as his "vehicle" one Jiddu Krishnamurti. He has been trained for his mission by Mrs. Besant and Mr. Leadbeater since 1910, when he was placed under their guardianship by his father, J. Narayaniah.[14] He is to play the role of the reincarnate Christ in Christian countries, and the Boddhisattva or Maitreya for those lands where Buddhism and Hinduism prevail. By such a plan the adherents of Christianity, Buddhism, and Hinduism are to be captured with one master stroke. As referred to in another paragraph the Krishnamurti cult has involved the society in endless trouble. On July 11, 1912 Mr. Narayaniah demanded the return of his two boys, Krishnamurti and Nitayanandam, as he feared the degrading influence of the immoral Leadbeater. The father finally brought suit and won the case, Leadbeater admitting immoral practices. A higher court, however, reversed the decision. Krishnamurti was then sent to England to be educated.

Upon his return to India many Theosophists bowed down before him, touching his feet with their hands, and induced Hindus to accord him similar honors. The *Indu Prakash* protested against such practices in the following language: "Esoteric teachings corrupt both the teacher and the taught, the Guru and the Shisya alike, and when they center round or crystallize into a specific *cult of individual deifications,* the potentialities and even the actualities of mischief are very great, very varied, and very insidious." The *Maharatta,* another Indian journal, made this editorial comment: "Can even the most original of minds conceive a more ludicrous setting for the second incarnation of Christ than the close guardianship of the blighting arms of a professor of Onanism?"[15]

On December 15, 1925 the Associated Press reported that Theosophists were ready to accord Krishnamurti special honors during the Christmas season when unusual manifestations would set him forth as the new Teacher. Four days later Arthur E. Mann cabled from London to the *New York World:* "The Theosophical Society and its branches throughout the world are at odds over the plan of its head, Mrs. Annie Besant and Bishop (!) Charles W. Leadbeater to proclaim a Messiah. So serious is the internal strife

[13] *Ibid.* pp. 35-37.

[14] Other variants of the father's name are: Narayana, cf. Farquhar, *op. cit.*, p. 276; Naramaniah, cf., Fraser, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

[15] Fraser, *op. cit.*, pp. 28 ff.

among Theosophists, that it is likely a determined effort will be made to throw off the domination of the bishop." Leadbeater is called by the reporter a bishop of the Liberal Catholic Church, "an offshoot of the Roman Catholic Church."

The strife has of late assumed larger proportions due to Krishnamurti's refusal, as is reported, to act his part at a recent theosophical gathering. He seems to be growing tired of being Mrs. Besant's toady, and of finding himself hailed as the "Messiah of the Tennis Courts." How Mrs. Besant will get out of this situation remains to be seen.

Theosophy is Pantheistic

According to some, Theosophy is in Coleridge's phrase a "painted atheism." Theoretically it is pantheistic. Nature is not spoken of as a creation, but rather as an emanation or series of emanations of the All-One or It in which reproduction plays a central role. All pantheistic systems soonor or later overemphasize the reproduction phenomena. Hinduism still accords degrading rites an important place. The great majority of Hindus have become polytheistic, and it is interesting to note that Theosophic leaders have shown polytheistic leanings. Mrs. Besant had an idol placed before the main building of the Central Hindu College which she founded in 1898 and modeled after the missionary colleges.

Bruhn's Analysis of the Present System

An article of exceptional merit on the Theosophical Society is by W. Bruhn in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart.* He differentiates between two sets of ideas in the system taught by Theosophists today, one of them an *Erkenntnisreihe,* the other an *Entwickelungsreihe.* The former has a monistic basis; The goal of man is the thisworldly nirvana—a mystical-intellectual identification with the One Eternal Existence. To gain this experience one must have mastered his senses completely. The second is based on a dualistic worldview, and a pessimistic evaluation of life. Its goal is the transcendent Pari-Nirvana, which may be gained by being absorbed by the Higher Ego through the practice of *Yoga.* While the *Erkenntnisreihe* is a sort of Brahmanism in Christian garb, the *Entwickelungsreihe* is a mixture of Buddhism and Brahmanism.[16]

The system has no motive power which makes for righteousness, no call to repentance. It offers nothing of value to the weak and the sinful. Esoteric or secret doctrine is always for a select few—not for the vulgar many. Its emphasis is on *gnosis,* on *gnana marga,* on esoteric *knowledge.*

[16] "Theosophische Gesellschaft," *Die Religion fuer Geschichte und Gegenwart,* V, pp. 1210-1215.

THE BEGINNINGS OF RELIGIOUS JOURNALISM IN THE LOUISIANA TERRITORY

By Rev. J. H. Horstmann

The phrasing of the subject does not imply a belief on the part of the writer that religious journalism reached a very high degree of development during the days of the Louisiana Territory. In the nature of the case religious journalism presupposes clearly defined and stabilized conditions of religious life and work, and this, in the case of the Louisiana Territory, began only after the purchase of the Territory by the United States, 125 years ago. The phrasing was suggested partly by the writer's personal predilection, and partly to indicate the angle from which it seemed most natural for him to make a study of the history of the church in that part of the country. The emphasis will be rather strongly on the beginnings, both Catholic and Protestant, in so far as they may be outlined in the brief time at my disposal, as they led up to the establishment of religious journalism as an expression of religious life and work in the region covered by the Territory.

Political History

In dealing with the progress of events in the Louisiana Territory it must be remembered that the boundaries of the region known by that name were repeatedly changed before it became a part of the United States. First discovered in 1540 by the Spaniards under Coronado, coming from the southwest, who seems to have penetrated to what is now central Missouri, or possibly even to the Mississippi, below the mouth of the Missouri, it was entered a year later by De Soto, coming from the southeast, who apparently traversed a portion of what is now southeast Missouri, the whole drained by the Mississippi, Missouri, and Ohio rivers was formally claimed for France by La Salle on April 9, 1682. The name Louisiana had however, been used three years earlier in a French report of the journeys of Joliet and Marquette down the Mississippi in 1673.

By the treaty of Nov. 3, 1762, France ceded this original Louisiana Territory to Spain. Not all the territory described in that treaty, however, was delivered to Spain, and on Feb. 10, 1763 Spain ceded to Great Britian all of her territory, undescribed as to boundaries, south of latitude 31 and east of the Mississippi river. In that same treaty France ceded to Great Britian the territory east of the Mississippi and north of latitude 31, which three months before she had plainly ceded to Spain, so that when the actual delivery by France to Spain occurred, April 21, 1764, the territorial boundaries of Louisiana included only the region drained

by the western tributaries of the Mississippi. It was this territory which was secretly ceded back to France by Spain in the secret treaty of San Ildefonso, Oct. 1, 1800. In 1783 the territory south of latitude 31 and east of the Mississippi was ceded back to Spain by Great Britain. The Louisiana Purchase Territory, acquired by the United States April 30, 1803, included all the region drained by the western tributaries of the Mississippi, plus the area east of the Mississippi and south of latitude 31, as far as the Rio Perdido, the present eastern boundary between Alabama and Florida. It is in this territory in which the beginnings of religious journalism, as explained above, are to be traced until the beginning of the Civil War, which may well be considered as the close of the period of "beginnings" in the Territory. In fact, by that time the Territory, as such, had long ceased to exist, as six great states (Louisiana, 1812; Missouri, 1821; Arkansas, 1836; Iowa, 1846; Minnesota, 1858, and Kansas, 1861) and various territories had grown out of the region covered by the Louisiana Purchase.

But the fruitless march of Coronado did not destroy the expectations of the Spaniards, nor did the tragic fate of De Soto restrain their exploration enterprises. Many of the adventurers who followed no doubt perished in their wandering, and many tales of hardship and endurance among savage Indians must have passed into oblivion because unchronicled by any survivor. So far as is known no Europeans again reached the Mississippi until, during the summer of 1673, Marquette and Joliet discovered and explored the river as far south as the mouth of the Arkansas. Nine years after that event La Salle explored the river to its mouth and, as stated above, founded the French empire in the new world.

Character of the Population

But the French trappers and fur traders entering the region from Canada made no permanent settlements, and it was only at a very few scattered and isolated places that white men took up their residence around the stations founded by the French Catholic missionaries. In 1763, when the eastern portion of original Louisiana Territory came into the possession of Great Britain, such mission stations had been established at Kaskaskia (1675), on the Mississippi, in southwestern Illinois; Biloxi (1699) on the Gulf of Mexico, in what is now Mississippi; Vincennes (1702) on the Wabash, in what is now southwestern Indiana; at the headwaters of the Wabash, (1720) near the present Ft. Wayne. West of the Mississippi there was New Orleans (1718), and St. Genevieve (1735), near the Mississippi, in what is now eastern Missouri. St. Louis was founded in 1764; St. Charles, Mo., in 1769, and Dubuque, Iowa, in 1788.

When George Washington was born the entire population of the Louisiana Territory, (not counting Indiana), may have been 5,000 whites and about half as many blacks; a considerable number of Catholic priests and friars were scattered through the vast stretches of the country from Biloxi to the Great Lakes and the prairies of the Dakotas, which was still practically a wilderness. It was only after the War for American Independence that the population began to increase more rapidly through the coming of English-speaking settlers from New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Carolina.

Daniel Boone, who came into the Louisiana Territory in 1795, was a forerunner among the pioneers who crossed the Mississippi. Among those who followed, some, like Boone, continued to live as hunters and backwoods farmers. Others settled in St. Louis, or some of the Creole settlements along the rivers, or joined the parties of French traders who ascended the Missouri and the Mississippi to barter paint, beads, powder, and blankets for the furs of the Indians. The great rivers were all important for these traders. Some of them entered the Missouri as early as 1700, and by the time St. Louis was founded that river had been explored for a thousand miles of its course. Until the Civil War the history of the Missouri was the history of the country through which it flowed.

The Economic Development

Before the days of the steamboat, under the Spanish regime, the journey between St. Louis and New Orleans was a dangerous proposition, because of vagabond Indians, white marauders, Spanish armed extortion and arrest and the natural dangers of the stream. In addition, exposure and bad diet ordinarily destroyed one-third of the crew. Naturally, the coming of the steamboat changed the whole picture of the Territory. In 1812 the first steamboat from the Ohio reached New Orleans; five years later the first steamboat came to St. Louis, and two years after this the Missouri carried its first steamboat. The great steamboat traffic of the Mississippi and its tributaries, which in 1850 employed 4,000 boats, had its own distinctive history and was a tremendous factor in the economic development of the whole region.

It was about at this time that the three important land highways, the Santa Fe Trail, the Oregon Trail, and the Overland Trail, came into use. The early traders had caravans of horses or mules; wheeled vehicles came about 1825. Before the coming of the railways these highways were the chief trade routes of the west. Without the control of these river and land routes, made possible through the purchase of the Louisiana Territory, the West could not have been settled by Americans.

Except within easy distance of the Lower Missouri there was practically no agriculture in the Territory until after the Civil War. Until long after the purchase of Louisiana Territory, the fur trade, with headquarters at St. Louis, was the dominant industry, with an annual business, at the height of its development, of about $250,000. During the fifty years after the purchase of the Territory by the United States this trade cost about 300 human lives and caused a property loss of some $200,000. The competition of the Hudson Bay and Northwest Fur Companies added some dark pages to the frontier history of the Territory. The employees of these companies, hunters, trappers, camp-keepers, artisans, boatsmen, managers, clerks, etc., made up the great army of the wilderness traffic. "They staked their lives against Indians and their earnings at the gaming tables, when their work was done after months and even years of isolation. These pioneers and pathfinders were absolutely fearless, not in the cause of settlement and possession but for the sake of the commerce afforded by the wild things of the forest."

In 1832 George Catlin, a St. Louis artist, ascended the Missouri and made many paintings of Indians in their primitive habitat which are preserved in the United States National Museum at Washington.

The Louisiana Purchase closed a long contest for ascendancy in the Mississippi Valley. The great growth of the population on the upper Mississippi late in the 18th century caused a demand for freedom from all restrictions of commerce on the river imposed by the Spaniards. The desire of Napoleon to create a colonial empire in America led to the secret treaty of St. Idlefonse in 1800, by which France acquired that portion of Louisiana formerly ceded to Spain. Three years later fear of American and English invasion induced Napoleon to sell the Territory to the United States. Except for this gigantic real estate deal the Monroe Doctrine would not have been possible.

The Church Enters the Territory

The history of the Christian Church in the Louisiana Territory opens with a remarkable scene in the camp of De Soto one morning in May 1541, as reported by Carcilasso de la Vego, a Spanish writer, who, while not a participant in De Soto's memorable march, obtained his information from one of the soldiers who were fortunate enough to return. A company of Indians had come to the camp with the request that their white visitor pray to his God for rain, as their fields were parched for want of water. De Soto gave orders to hew down the highest and largest pine tree in the vicinity and to construct of it a cross. This cross was then erected

on an artificial mound near the river, which had served the Indians as a watch tower. The next morning a solemn procession was organized, the priests and friars chanting the litany, and the soldiers responding. Fully a thousand persons are said to have been in the procession, and when they arrived before the cross they sank on their knees, offered solemn prayers and kissed the cross, many thousands of savages looking on. "Ever and anon they raised their eyes to heaven and made signs with their faces and hands as if asking God to listen to the Christians prayers. Then they would raise a low and wailing cry like people in excessive grief, echoed by the plaintive murmurings of their children's voices." De Soto and his followers "were moved to tenderness to behold in a strange and heathen land a savage people worshiping with such humility and tears the emblem of our redemption. The solemnities were closed with a Te Deum and in the middle of the ensuing night, marvelous to relate, a plenteous rain refreshed the parching corn. When the Indian warriors full of joy desired to express their gratitude to De Soto he told them to give thanks to God who created the heavens and the earth and who is the bestower of these and far greater mercies." (Houck, History of Missouri, Vol. 1, pages 105-106.)

Thus in what is now southeastern Missouri the cross, as the type of Christian religion, was first planted on the banks of the Mississippi river and the silent forests re-echoed for the first time with Christian hymns of gratitude. Literally, "the voice cried in the wilderness," but although it reached and was echoed by every heart there present it died away and was forgotten as far as any known records show. The Christian message was not heard in that region again for many generations.

Marquette entered the Mississippi by way of the Great Lakes, Green Bay and the Fox and Wisconsin Rivers, baptizing Indians on the way, from June to September, 1673. In 1679 Duluth penetrated to the extreme western end of Lake Superior and rescued Hennepin from his Sioux captors. After La Salle descended the Mississippi, in 1682, French Catholic missionaries established themselves on both sides of the river as far south as its mouth, thus cutting across the Spanish line of missions from Florida to the Pacific. Since Marquette and the priests who followed him were under the jurisdiction of the See of Quebec, erected in 1658, St. Valier, the second bishop of that diocese, who administered the office from 1688 to 1727, "sought to bring everything in his vast diocese into strict regularity by precise rules and regulations and suffered no infringement of what he regarded as the rights of his see." Many of his general and particular acts affected the mission stations in the Mississippi Valley and a pastoral letter he issued

in 1692, together with the statutes adopted at the three diocesan synods (1690, 1694, 1698), sought to introduce order and system into the religious work and worship from the very beginning. The celebration of the mass or the conferring of baptism in private houses was forbidden in places where there was a church, and in places where there was no church, mass could be said only in houses selected for the purpose and approved by the bishop. The attendance of the faithful at mass on Sundays and holidays was to be rigorously maintained. Those who refused to pay tithes were to be excluded from communion; catechetical instruction was to be given regularly; baptisms, marriages and interments were to be properly registered; the abuse of many worshipers leaving the church during the sermon was censured, and the faithful were exhorted to almsgiving. St. Valier thus seems to have watched with great care over the missions even in the remote parts of the diocese. He declined to give to any religious order the complete and exclusives direction of religious affairs in the Territory, deeming it better to assign districts to religious or collegiate bodies, or to secular priests, all of these to be subject to avicar-general, made from time to time by the bishop of Quebec until a See could be established in the territory itself.

If we think of religious journalism in its broadest and most fundamental sense, as an effort to disseminate religious information and to mould religious sentiment, this pastoral letter of Bishop St. Valier of Quebec is no doubt the very earliest beginning of religious journalism in the Louisiana Territory, and it is probably safe to say that it made just as much—or as little—impression on the Indian trappers and fur traders in the great wilderness of the West as do the more elaborate and bulky religious journals of today upon their readers. Those who were interested in religion were encouraged and edified, while those who were not interested—well, that is another story.

New Orleans, Capital of the Territory

After the founding of New Orleans the lower portion of the Territory increased gradually in population. But the settlers were not of the sturdy industrious type which built up Canada in the early days. Times had changed too; less respect was paid to religion, and officials, instead of upholding the church and its ministry, or setting an example of respect for morality and religion, frequently offered a pretext for those who were viciously inclined to plunge into every kind of excess. In the documents of that period instances constantly occur where the ministers of religion were openly treated with contempt.

In January 1722, New Orleans consisted of about 100 tem-

porary sites, there were only a few fairly well built homes; no chapel had yet been erected; half a wretched warehouse had at first been assigned for a chapel. Charlevoix, a Catholic historian of that period, says that although the owners "had kindly consented to lend it to the Lord, he had scarcely taken possession when he was requested to withdraw and seek shelter under a tent." Yet some rude structure must soon have been put up for it is reported that the hurricane of September 12, 1722, which prostrated 30 log huts, also demolished the church.

Of the state of religion in the French settlements about 1750 there are no documents to guide the historian. The Capuchin fathers, whose influence seems to have predominated in New Orleans and lower Louisiana, apparently discharged their functions quietly, as allusions to them are only rarely made in the official dispatches or other writings. According to aCatholic writer, however, religion certainly did not gain; vice increased unchecked, and outside of New Orleans, no public institutions, religious or charitable, were established that show a community imbued with faith. According to O'Gorman, (The Roman Catholic Church in the U. S., page 211; also chapters IX, XIV, and XX), Louisiana just before the war of American Independence contained a number of scattered communities of French descent and language roughly organized, but living as they did in utter unbelief and contempt of religion and morality, it would be an unjust reproach on Catholicism to call them Catholics. Nor had French missionaries achieved any great success among the Choctaws and Chickasaws of the south.

What was left of the Louisiana Territory after the treaties of 1762-63-64 (briefly referred to in the beginning of this paper) was transferred to the diocese of Santiago de Cuba in 1777 and remained in that jurisdiction for ten years, when it was assigned to the diocese of Havana. In 1793 the diocese of New Orleans was erected.

In 1726 an Ursuline Convent had been authorized for New Orleans and in the following year a hospital and a school as well as an academy had been established. This convent is now the oldest educational institution for women in the United States; and the original building is still standing, the oldest structure of its kind in the United States, and the oldest building in the territory purchased from France. It was of particular importance to the colony, where the number of women was small. In response to repeated appeals by the governors for honest wives and mothers several shiploads of girls were sent by royal authority to be married to the colonists. As a proof of her respectability each girl was furnished by the bishop from whose diocese she came with a curiously wrought casket in which to keep jewelry and other per-

sonal belongings. Hence these girls are known in the Louisiana history as "casket girls." Each band of girls on arriving at New Orleans was confided to the care of the Ursuline Sisters until they were married to colonists able to provide for their support. (Catholic Encyclopedia.) Many of the best families of the state are proud to trace their descent from these "Casket Girls."

Bernard Viel (1736-1821) was the first native American to enter the priesthood in Louisiana. Mary Turpin (1709-1761), daughter of a Canadian father and an Indian mother, was the first American-born nurse in the convent, making a name for herself as a devoted and faithful nurse in the frequent calamities (fire, storm, flood and epidemics) which visited New Orleans during the early days. The Jesuit fathers introduced the culture of sugar cane, oranges and figs and did much to promote the development of the colony in other ways. Questions of jurisdiction caused serious friction between Capuchins and Jesuits, which was summarily settled by the spoliation of the Jesuits by the French Government. In 1763 the Jesuits were suppressed by the supreme council of Louisiana, their property confiscated and sold.

In 1763, when Louisiana was ceded to Spain, New Orleans had about 4,000 inhabitants. As the religious affairs were transferred to the diocese of Santiago de Cuba contradictory reports about conditions in the territory brought about an investigation by the Spanish ecclesiastics. The easy and genial ways of the French brethren seemed scandalous to the strict Spanish disciplinarians and the bishop of Cuba was informed concerning "the lax methods of conduct and administration." Up to this time confirmation had never been administered in Louisiana, on account of difficulties connected with the visits of the bishop, and an auxiliary bishop was appointed, with residence in New Orleans, who was to visit the missions on the Mississippi as well as those in Mobile, Pensacola, and St. Augustine. In 1785 there was in New Orleans one parish priest with four assistants, and resident priests at fourteen other places, among them St. Louis, St. Charles, St. Genevieve (in what is now Missouri), and where Galveston now stands. The first Irish Catholic priests came to New Orleans late in the seventeen-eighties.

American Settlers Arrive

The Spanish authorities were greatly alarmed at the coming of the American settlers to New Orleans and it was particularly emphasized that liberty of conscience was not to be extended beyond the first generation and that the children of immigrants would either have to become Catholic or be expelled, and that this should be explained to the settlers who did not profess the Catholic

faith. No preacher of any religion but the Catholic should be allowed to come into the provinces. This spirit of bigotry and intolerance, however, was not shared by most of the resident population, for the early Protestant missionaries were often housed and fed by the Catholics, and with a few exceptions they were treated with uniform courtesy. The people, however, were satisfied with their religion, which had been that of their ancestors for generations, and they saw no necessity for a change.

The first bishop in Louisiana, Penalver, complained bitterly of the American immigrants and the measure of tolerance accorded them by the people, and earnestly advised that places where the Americans were allowed to settle should be rigidly restricted. This attitude of the Spanish government and the ecclesiastics, as pointed out in Theodore Roosevelt's WINNING OF THE WEST (Volume 4, page 290) was a strong factor in creating dissatisfaction among the American settlers on both sides of the Mississippi. "Whether the frontiersman did or did not possess deep religious convictions, it was sure that he would refuse to be coerced into becoming a Catholic, and his children were sure to fight as soon as they were given the choice of changing their faith or abandoning their property."

When Bishop Penalver arrived in New Orleans in 1795 he called the first and only synod in the diocese of colonial New Orleans. He also issued a letter of instruction, deploring the fact that many of his flock were so far away as to be inaccessible to him and enjoining the priests to walk in the footsteps of Jesus and in all things to fulfill their duties. This letter is still preserved in the archives of the diocese, and with the call for the synod is the only document in existence signed by the first bishop of New Orleans. If we adhere to the broad definition of religious journalism previously referred to, these documents may be regarded as a second contribution to the beginnings of religious journalism in the Louisiana Territory, almost exactly a century after the bishop of Quebec had issued his first pastoral letter for a similar purpose.

The writer has been unable to secure anything like reliable and adequate data concerning the beginnings of religious journalism in New Orleans, with the exception of one French periodical, "Le Propagateur Catholique," first published in November, 1842, a rather ambitious religious and literary journal edited by Fr. Perche, which played an important part in adjusting trouble which had arisen regarding the appointment of priests.

"In 1803 the most important political event since the adoption of the United States Constitution, the purchase of the Louisiana Territory, opened to the Protestant churches a new and immense field for missionary activity. This vast territory which nearly

doubled the domain of the United States was the last remnant of the projected Catholic empire which had fallen in 1763. Passed back and forth with the vicissitudes of European politics between French and Spanish masters, it had made small progress in either civilization or religion. . . . Not many years passed, however, before it became the arena in which all the various forces of American Christianity were to be found contending against all the powers of darkness not, however, without dealing some mutual blows in the melee." (Bacon, History of American Christianity, pages 220, 221.)

The Development of Religious Journalism

Much fuller information is available concerning beginnings of religious life in St. Louis, where the first church building was erected in 1776, and which soon became the center for religious work in the upper section of the Mississippi Valley. It became an independent diocese in 1826.

Thanks to the diligent labors of Father Rothensteiner, official historian of the idocese of St. Louis, who is the author of "A Sketch of Catholic Journalism in St. Louis" all the important facts concerning the beginnings of religious journalism in that section has been made available. The first Catholic periodical published in St. Louis was *"The Shepherd of the Valley,"* the first number of which appeared July 7, 1832. For the first year it is written in English and French, but with the opening of the second volume English alone is used. Its career was only brief, however, as the final number appeared July 2, 1836. *"The Catholic Cabinet"* made its first appearance in 1843, originated and in part at least edited by Bishop Kendrick of St. Louis, who had edited the "Catholic Herald" in Philadelphia several years previously. In November, 1845 the *"Catholic News Letter,"* also edited under the supervision of Bishop Kendrick, appeared and continued until April, 1848. Bishop Kendrick, however, was deeply convinced of the necessity of the Catholic press and in 1850 revived *"The Shepherd of the Valley."* Financial difficulties, owing to a lack of support from the Catholic public, was the cause of its demise in 1854.

At about this time the demand appeared for a German Catholic paper, and the *"Catholisches Sonntagsblatt"* appeared on Dec. 1, 1850, but changed its name in the following year to *"Herold des Glaubens"* which still exists under the title of *"Amerika-Herold des Glaubens,"* and has always had a wide circulation in St. Louis and throughout the West and Southwest. In this connection we must not overlook the *"St. Louis Leader,"* which ran from March, 1855 to October, 1856 as a weekly and as a daily until 1858. It was the original "great religious daily" of St. Louis, as the Catho-

lic Encyclopedia says, "though it flavored its religion largely with democratic politics." In 1858 the publication of *"The Western Banner"* was begun but discontinued in 1860.

The first Protestant church in St. Louis, Christ Church Cathedral (Protestant Episcopal) was organized in 1819, and Protestantism soon increased in influence in the city and vicinity and its development in that neighborhood would be subject for special research and study. It was during the third decade of the nineteenth century that German settlers began to gather in and around St. Louis and organized churches. Two of the earliest religious journals in the field were published in German, the *"Lutheraner,"* official organ of the Missouri Synod appeared in 1884, and the *"Friedensbote,"* representing the Evangelical Synod of North America in 1850. Both these periodicals are still in existence. The only English Protestant religious journal established during that period of which I was able to learn was the *"St. Louis Christian Advocate"* (Methodist Episcopal, South) which appeared in 1850, and is now completing its 78th year. From 1851-1853 the Norwegian Lutherans in Minnesota published *"Maanedstidende for Den Norsk Lutherske Kirke i Amerika."* After suspending for three years it continued from 1856 to 1874 when it was changed from a monthly to a weekly and was named *"Evangelisk Luthersk Kirketidende"* until 1927, when at the union of three Norwegian church bodies it was consolidated with the papers from the other bodies to form the present *"Lutheraneren."*

Acknowledgments for valuable assistance rendered in the complication of this paper are due, besides the sources already mentioned, to Miss Julie Koch of the Roosevelt High School, St. Louis, Miss M. Renshaw of Howard Memorial Library, New Orleans, and to Mr. W. O. Hart, also of that city.

If his paper has helped to reveal the necessity of further and more thorough-going research by experts in church history in this vast and virgin field the efforts of the writer will have been amply rewarded.

Note: Paper read at the fourth annual Literary Meeting of the American Society of Church History, Chicago Theological Seminary, March 30-31, 1928.

Die Wichtigkeit rechter Stellungnahme zur Zeitlage.

Von T. Kugler.

Ein früherer Amtsnachbar des Referenten pflegte in seinen Predigten Himmel und Hölle so anschaulich zu beschreiben, als ob er an beiden Orten selbst gewesen und sich vom Tatbestand überzeugt hätte. Besonders in den von ihm benutzten ausgedehnten und naiven Illustrationen, wonach z. B. alle Seligen Kronen trugen, war seine Schilderung doch so lebendig gehalten, daß sie dem Hörer ein bestimmtes Bild vor Augen malte. Offenbar hatte der Betreffende eine festgeprägte Ansicht über seinen Gegenstand und darum machten seine Worte, trotz unbiblischer Einzelheiten, wirklichen Eindruck. Mag zwar eine Schwalbe noch keinen Sommer bringen, auch die Wahl obigen Beispiels mehr zufällig wie glücklich sein; dürfte dasselbe vielleicht nicht doch und gerade durch seine Eigenart nur um so mehr den hohen Wert der Geltendmachung einer einheitlichen und auch richtigen Auffassung mitbezeugen, wovon eben vorliegender Aufsatz redet? Sollte nun in demselben die öftere Angabe einschlägiger Literatur vermißt werden, so liegt dies daran, daß Ref. letztere weniger in Büchereien als in laufenden Zeitschriften findet. Solche Quellen unterliegen aber zuvor seiner Kritik, ehe sie etwa zur Bestärkung nicht irgendeiner denominationellen, sondern der eigenen Ansicht desselben dienen dürfen; andernfalls hätte vorliegender Artikel schon gleich am Schreiber selbst seines Zwecks verfehlt. Doch mißdeute man dies nicht so, als ob Genannter nun hier in den großen Zeitfragen das letzte Wort zu sprechen oder aus voreingenommener Position heraus den überzeugten Vertreter andrer Ansicht nach Art eines Klopffechters zu behandeln gedenke. Vgl. Römer 2, 1—4.

Die Ausführungen des Themas sollen des weiteren in zwei Abschnitten erfolgen:

1. Bedeutung einer einheitlichen Weltanschauung;
2. Gewissenhafte Geltendmachung der Position.

1. **Das erfolgreiche Wirken** eines Geistlichen ist heute mehr wie je von seiner Stellungnahme zur Gegenwart bedingt und von der **Entschiedenheit,** mit welcher er jene geltend macht. Der Rufer im Streit muß im Vordertreffen stehen und zielbewußte Schritte tun. Der Sinn seiner Worte sollte über alles Deuteln klar sein. Zumal heute, wo wir eine Verwirklichung des sonst nur von Dichtern geahnten Erklingens der Sphärenmusik angebahnt sehen, da uns tönende Luftwellen als Träger vernehmbarer Laute dienen; wo ferner die mikroskopischen Wunder der Elektronenwelt uns schier ins Gebiet des Unsichtbaren und Unfaßbaren überleiten; wo zu-

gleich aber auch der verschärfte Widerspruch der Parteien einer derartigen Entscheidung zustrebt, die jede Neutralität ausschließt, da sie noch über die von Schleiermacher befürchtete Lösung des Knotens der Geschichte hinausgeht, — da ist gewiß Pauli Wort doppelt beherzigenswert: Leide mit als ein guter Streiter Jesu Christi, 2. Tim. 2, 3; wobei dies Mit-leiden als intensives Anteilnehmen an allem Wohl und Wehe der Menschheit zu verstehen ist: „homo sum, humani nihil mihi alienum puto." Dies seelische Miterleben ist es, das noch jeden Gotteszeugen seinen Zeitgenossen, ja, Gottes Sohn uns allen als Bruder menschlich nahe brachte. Dies ist es auch, was der Botschaft der Propheten und dem Zeugnis der Apostel und ihrer Nachfolger die Herzen erschloß. Diese **Lebenssympathie** ist da vorhanden, wo Herz und Sinn des Redenden sich zu Organen des göttlichen Geistes in werbendem Ewigkeitsernst geheiligter Liebe weihen. Fußt jener zudem auf dem gefestigten Grund einer entschiedenen Position, so wird ihm auch verliehen, das erlösende Wort zu sprechen, das gesegnete, welches der Hörer Willen zum rechten Tun bestimmt.

Wer nämlich sein Leben derart dem Wohl der Brüder widmet, muß frei sein von unsicherem Schwanken, dem darf kein unklares, verschwommenes Bild das Auge trüben, das unverwandt dem erstrebten Ziel zugewendet ist. Trotz des sachlichen Unterschieds, der zwischen Propheten und Aposteln, als speziellen Sendboten, und den übrigen Botschaftern des Herrn bestehen bleibt, muß eben doch die jenen eigene entschiedene Haltung auch für die letzteren derart zutreffen, daß jeder, dem ihr strafendes Wort gilt, noch heute unfehlbar wissen muß: Du bist der Mann! So paradox es klingen mag, wird gerade in unsrer Zeit diese Haltung von einem um so höheren Standpunkt aus zu vertreten sein, je tiefer das moralische Niveau unsers Volkes liegt. Unsre Kirchen und Gemeinden sind auch bereits derart sozialisiert, daß, wenn sie nicht völlig säkularisiert werden sollen, ihre Führer vor allem ihren Standpunkt ganz bedeutend höher zu nehmen haben, als das in den letzten Jahrzehnten geschah. Nur durch eine Neubelebung des prophetischen und apostolischen Lebensgeistes können unsre Kirchen wieder spiritualisiert werden. Soll die Kirche unsers Landes nicht den sich verstärkenden Mächten des Unglaubens schmählich erliegen, so ist ihr eine solche Erweckung not, die Leiter und Glieder einmütig neu belebt, eifrig und gewissenhaft ihren Beruf auszurichten, Salz der Erde und Licht der Welt zu sein. Freilich werden solche, denen vor allem zusteht **evangelistisch zu wirken**, zunächst im eigenen Kreise und allen verständlich in intensiver Weise zu zeugen haben. Sollte sich dabei das Vertreten einer begründeten Ueberzeugung bis zum Verzichten auf neuesten Kleiderschnitt erstrecken — wie etwa bei einem Sh. Eddy —, so ist das gewiß irgendeinem Vermissen ernster Prin-

zipientreue weit vorzuziehen. Soll unser Wirken überzeugungsvoll und segensreich sich gestalten, so muß das Vorbild geheiligter Lebensführung das Wortzeugnis handreichend bekräftigen.

Obschon böse Gewissen das immer noch vertuschen wollen, hat ja unser Land die unselige Ernte seines Verhaltens während des Krieges noch immer einzuheimsen. Landweite Gewissenlosigkeit und ein überhandnehmendes Verbrechertum kennzeichnen die öffentliche Lage, der eine zunehmende Entfremdung der Jugend von der Kirche ein besonders bedrohliches Gepräge verleiht. Es mag wirklich, wie Dr. Selbie das sagt, von einer **Ummodelung der christlichen Lehre in modernen Ausdrücken** der Fortbestand unsrer Kirchen abhängen, da dem entkirchlichten Menschen bereits so manche religiöse Bezeichnungen fremd und unverständlich klingen. Dem Theologen und Geistlichen sollte aber zudem auch die Bedeutung des Postulats einer selbst errungenen und zeitgemäß zu revidierenden Weltanschauung unschwer einleuchten. Die Direktive einer solchen vermag nicht nur sein ganzes Wirken einheitlich zu gestalten, sondern verleiht ihm auch erst den Charakter einer Persönlichkeit, mit der zu rechnen ist. Man wird ja wohl jenen Ausdruck „zeitgemäß revidiert" nicht dahin mißverstehen, als ob etwa ein geistlicher Führer sich jeder neuen Mode und Manier des Zeitgeistes ungeprüft anpassen sollte. Nein, von ihm darf man vielmehr Festigkeit und Einheitlichkeit des Handelns erwarten, und zwar **auf Grund einer zeitgemäßen Weltanschauung,** die den tatsächlichen Ergebnissen modernen Forschens und Wissens gebührende Rechnung trägt. Nur ein gewissenhafter Fortschritt in dieser Hinsicht erhält uns auf der Höhe der Zeit; denn so wenig einst einem David die Rüstung Sauls zum Sieg über den Philister verholfen hätte, kann uns veraltetes Rüstzeug — Denk- und Ausdrucksweise vergangener Jahrhunderte — zum Ueberwinden des modernen Goliath schlagfertig machen. Wollen wir den dringenden Anforderungen der Gegenwart gerecht werden, so dürfen wir im ernstlichen Ringen um ein wirklich zutreffendes Zeitbild nicht erlahmen, um dann diesem gemäß unsre Anschauung zu modifizieren. Wer über seinen Pfarrzaun nicht hinausschaut, mag bald die Führerschaft auch in der eigenen Gemeinde einbüßen.

Freilich können wir die Gegenwart nur auf **Grundlage der Vergangenheit** verstehen, weshalb unser historisches, geologisches und sonstig naturwissenschaftliches Interesse einer steten Pflege bedarf. Neben der unvermeidlich anhaltenden Auseinandersetzung mit sonstigen Zeitströmungen, also sozialen und politischen Tendenzen, religiösen Bewegungen und vorherrschenden theologischen Ansichten, dürfen wir doch auch einer solchen mit den neuen philosophischen Richtungen nicht aus dem Weg gehen, wenn wir unsre Stellung Gott und der Welt gegenüber nach allen Seiten hin ge-

wissenhaft nachprüfen wollen. Auch in diesem Sinn gilt noch H. W. Beechers Wort:

"Laws and institutions are constantly tending to gravitate. Like clocks, they must be occasionally cleansed, and wound up, and set to true time."

In unserm „Evangelischen Magazin" bot der jetzige Redakteur, 1918, in drei fortlaufenden Heften eine sehr beherzigenswerte praktische Anregung dazu, wie jeder Theologe sich sein eigenes dogmatisches Lehrgebäude selbst errichten könne. Der Genannte machte sodann im Januar 1922, a. a. O. in einem höchst lesenswerten Artikel auf den **Wert des Studiums der Philosophie** für den Theologen aufmerksam, da deren ernstliches Studium die beste Schulung zu streng logischem Denken und selbständigem Gedankenflug bietet. Es wird nun dem werten Leser wohl klar sein, daß ohne ein Studium von Logik und Geschichte der Philosophie die schwierige Konstruktion eines stichhaltigen und umfassenden Weltbildes schlechterdings ebenso unmöglich ist, als die Fixierung eines selbsterarbeiteten Entwurfs einer einheitlichen Dogmatik, die auf biblischem Grund doch auch ein umfassendes Bild nicht nur der Stellung des Menschen im Universum, sondern auch derjenigen des Einzelnen in seinem Verhältnis zu Gott zu bieten hat. Selbstredend gilt jene Bedingung auch bei Feststellung prinzipieller Leitsätze unsers sozialethischen Verhaltens. Der Mangel eines gewissenhaft durchstudierten Lehrgangs auch nur in der Logik macht sich im Land auf allerlei Gebieten, wie in der Legislatur, öffentlichen, zumal politischen Reden und leider sogar in Predigten peinlich fühlbar. Fehlen aber Vertreter und Lehrer des Volks hierin, kein wunder, wenn so viele aus der mehr urteilslosen Masse jeder noch so törichten und bedenklichen Neuerung zufallen. Was aber soll man erst zu der trostlosen Haltlosigkeit jener Männer in angesehener kirchlicher Stellung sagen, die während der letzten zehn Jahre ihren Glaubensabfall in gedruckten Bänden ausposaunten?

Beim Lesen oben erwähnter beiden Arbeiten (bitte dieselben a. a. O. nachzulesen) empfand Schreiber dieses jedesmal den Wunsch zu dem, wofür auch gegenwärtiger Aufsatz implizite das Wort redet, nämlich zur **Erziehung einer selbstgewonnenen religiösen Weltanschauung** und noch jetzt würde es daher nicht nur den Verfasser jener zwei Arbeiten interessieren, zu erfahren wieviel Leser wohl die darin enthaltenen heilsamen Ratschläge befolgt haben.

Soviel ist sicher, daß die Feststellung einer stichhaltigen religiösen Weltansicht nur durch Auseinandersetzung mit den faktischen Ergebnissen der exakten Wissenschaft, sowie den vorherrschenden phisophischen Richtungen in befriedigender Weise erfolgen kann. Freilich wird die Anschauung eines Theologen religiöser Art sein,

da er das Universum mit all seinen Vorgängen in Beziehung weiß zum ewigen Schöpfergott und Vater in Christo, ohne dessen Offenbarung es für uns keinen Weg zur Gotteserkenntnis und Gemeinschaft gibt. Keine Wissenschaft, nur die in Christo geoffenbarte Gottesgnade kann und wird die Menschheit dem ihr bestimmten Ziel zuführen — auch allen stolzen Irrwegen eines von Gott abgewandten menschlichen Geistes zum Trotz. Wollen wir aber **mit unsern Zeitgenossen in Fühlung** bleiben, so werden wir auf **ihre Denkweise** verständnisvoll einzugehen und uns auch möglichst ihrer **Sprechweise** anzupassen haben. Den rechten Einfluß auf sie ausüben, sie für Christum gewinnen, werden wir aber um so eher, je mehr sie das bei uns finden, was ihnen mangelt, nämlich einen festen Halt in einem Standpunkt, von dem aus, als von einer geistigen Zentrale, unser ganzes Wirken einheitliche Festigkeit bezieht. Diesem Postulat entspricht nichts anderes in dem Maße, wie eine wohlbegründete, den jetzigen Anforderungen entsprechende Weltanschauung, die auf einem Weltsystem beruht, in das auch die Tatsachen der exakten Wissenschaften sich einpassen und das auch einer Revision, bezugsweise Neuanordnung angemessen ist.

Bei solcher Voraussetzung bedarf es hier wohl kaum einer weiteren Erörterung darüber, daß auch **die evangelische Predigt** sich durchaus nicht derart auf der Höhe der Zeit zu halten vermag, daß sie etwa vorsichtig oder ängstlich modernen Ansichten ausweicht, sondern vielmehr auf dieselben derart eingeht, daß sie zur **Herstellung** des notwendigen **geistigen Rapports** dienen. Zu diesem Zweck wird allerdings eine von Zeit zu Zeit erneute kritische Vorarbeit erforderlich sein, welche auch die neueren wissenschaftlichen Ansprüche sachgemäß berücksichtigt, zu gelegentlicher Verwendung, wobei rein wissenschaftliche Ausdrücke möglichst gemeinverständlichen Raum geben; stets mit dem Ziel vor Augen, daß endlich unser Vortrag nicht in weltfernem Ton, sondern in heute verständlicher Denk- und Redeweise sich ergehe. Mehrere diesbezügliche Artikel der letzten Jahrgänge unsers „Magazins" führen diesen Gegenstand noch näher aus. Doch möchten wir oben Gesagtem noch ergänzend beifügen, daß in einer erwecklichen Ansprache, neben der in leicht verständlicher Form belehrenden Seite freilich auch jene mystische Not der Ueberweltlichkeit nicht fehlen darf, jenes: Ich glaube, darum rede ich — auch von dem, was kein Auge geschaut! Die dem Redner **abzufühlende Wirklichkeit des Ueberweltlichen** und seiner noch zumeist verborgenen sieghaften Kräfte, das wird doch wohl im letzten Grund darüber entscheiden, ob der göttliche Funke auch zündet; ob mit Menschen- und Engelzungen vergebens geredet wird oder aber der Zeuge neues Leben aus Gott vrmitteln darf. Dieser heilige Ewigkeitsernst mit nachfühlendem Erbarmen gepaart, muß der Forderung der Zeitgemäßheit stets die Wage halten.

Wem ernstlich am Werbedienst evangelischer Predigt gelegen, den befähigt die Beherzigung der bereits erwähnten Punkte zur Lösung unsrer wichtigsten Zeitfrage: Wie bieten wir unsern Zeitgenossen, was sie bedürfen und erwarten oder doch im Innersten suchen? Oder religiös motiviert: Wie machen wir die biblischen Wahrheiten, vor allem **das Evangelium dem modernen Menschen,** der dem altchristlichen Denken entwöhnt ist, doch noch verständlich und zugänglich? — Kurz zusammenfassend dürften wir nun darauf antworten: Indem wir unser Wirken derart einheitlich basieren, daß unsre intensive Bezeugung ewiger Lebenskräfte in Christo auch dem heutigen Weltbild und dem modernen Menschen Rechnung trägt. — Die gewiß ebenso schwierige wie interessante Herausarbeitung des modernen Weltbildes, auf Grund seiner geographisch-historisch und politisch sich verschiebenden Entwicklung hat inzwischen Dr. Dennert in seinem Büchlein: Das Weltbild usw., das Referent in Nr. 10 des „Friedensboten," 1928, angezeigt fand, dem Leser erspart, nicht aber die eigene umsichtige Nachprüfung und Beurteilung der heutigen höchst komplizierten und kritischen Sachlage. Die anhaltend rastlose Verworrenheit auf den meisten Gebieten bezeugt die Unfähigkeit der unlautern Vertreter militärischer Gewaltpolitik. Dieser düstere Hintergrund hebt um so mehr jene Lichtgestalten hervor, denen Gottes Reich allein am Herzen liegt und die dem Erlöser auch heute in selbstloser Bruderliebe folgen. Was die heutige Welt an Gutem und Edlem hat, sie verdankt es Christo und seinem Evangelium. Nur sein siegreiches Szepter wird einst das „große" Kriegsschwert zerschlagen, das wie jenes des Damokles nun über der ganzen friedlosen Menschheit hängt. Der endliche Heimzug der Erlösten aus dem irdischen Aegypten wird dann wohl auch unter ähnlichen Gerichts- und Gnadenwundern ergehen, wie jene es waren, die dem Auszug des alten Israel vorangingen und folgten. Zwar sind wir damit eigentlich schon aus dem Rahmen des alten Weltbildes gefallen, doch hängt ja dessen richtige Auffassung durchaus von unsrer religiösen Stellung ab. Haben wir keinen Halt im Glauben, so wird jenes Bild verzerrt erscheinen wie ein **Vexierbild,** sei es pessimistisch oder optimistisch, doch stets in einseitig **materialistischer Färbung.** Demgemäß wird sich dann auch die Weltanschauung aller gestalten, welche dieselbe nur von sichtbaren Ursachen und Gestaltungen ableiten. Dem Gläubigen allein ist das Erschauen eines der Wirklichkeit nahekommenden Bildes und die ableitende Entfaltung einer dem Gesamtbild entsprechenden Anschauung ermöglicht; welch letztere sich darin idealistisch gestaltet, daß sie im Werden und Vergehen doch auch das Ewigbleibende, im widerspruchsvollen und sich bekämpfenden Streben doch die Vollendung sich schon anbahnen sieht.

Wie aber gewinnen wir die Menschen unsrer Zeit für solch eine

christlich-ideale Weltanschauung? Die Antwort kann hier nicht anders lauten, als indem wir selbst erst lernen, auf die Gedankengänge des modernen Menschen einzugehen. Zuvor müssen wir ihn recht zu verstehen suchen, damit er dann auch uns verstehen kann. Dazu gehört eben, wie bereits erwähnt, daß wir neben fortgesetztem Studium der Bibel und Religionsforschung, uns mit den neueren philosophischen Phasen und auch mit den faktischen Resultaten der exakten Wissenschaften vertraut machen, um diese womöglich, als nicht dem biblischen Glauben widersprechend, sondern denselben noch mehr vertieft zu erweisen.

Sollte hier jemand einwenden, damit wird uns ja die Rolle von **Vermittlungs-Theologen** zugemutet, so wäre zu erwiedern, daß wir nicht nur stets das rechte Verständnis religiöser Wahrheiten zu vermitteln haben, sondern daß es heute gilt, solches auch den anwachsenden Kreisen derer gegenüber zu tun, welche vermeinen, Glauben und modernes Wissen widerstritten einander. Wir denken ja hier nicht an Preisgabe ewiger Glaubenswahrheiten oder an ein Verschweigen historischer Tatsachen, sondern an jene große Aufgabe, die darin besteht, durch ernste Vertiefung in wissenschaftliche Ergebnisse, unter Vergleich derselben mit den Heilstatsachen, deren Einklang herzustellen, um damit eine wohlbegründete Brücke zu errichten, die aufrichtigen Wahrheitsforschern beider Gebiete den Weg sichert zu gemeinsamer Weiterarbeit an der Erzielung der notwendigen und tatsächlichen Harmonie zwischen Ergebnissen exakter Wissenschaft und Feststellungen von Bibelforschung und Religionswissenschaft. Vgl. 1. Kor. 9, 21 ff.

Solchen, die diesen Weg gehen wollen, kann der bekannte K. Girgensohn zum Vorbild dienen, der ein Bahnbrecher dieser Richtung war. Diese Aufgabe wurde ihm seinerzeit von R. Seeberg nahe gelegt, der ihm in verständnisvoller Weise beigestanden, sich der materialistischen Fesseln des Unglaubens zu entledigen, dem Girgensohn in seiner Studienzeit greifbar nahe kam, da die gehörten theologischen Vorlesungen ihn kalt gelassen und sein fleißiges Bücherstudium ihn der unerbittlichen Logik negativer Geister preisgegeben hatte. Durch seltene Begabung sonderlich dazu befähigt, machte er sich nun mit zäher Ausdauer an dieses ihm gewiesene Lebenswerk. Er trat mit führenden Wissenschaftlern in Verbindung, um sich ihrer Korrektion bei Erledigung seiner Spezialforschungen zu bedienen. Sein positiv christlicher Standpunkt, den er inzwischen errungen, hat bei seinen neuen Kollegen erwünschten Eindruck gemacht, so daß er die von ihm erhoffte **Synthese von Wissenschaft und Theologie** vollziehen und damit eine Brücke schlagen durfte vom Christentum zur Seele des modernen Menschen. Seine eigentliche Lebensaufgabe, den **Bau einer einheitlichen christlichen Weltanschauung** hat er insofern gelöst, als sich eine solche

aus seinen Schriften zusammenstellen läßt. Bei ihm finden wir religiöses Interesse und wissenschaftlichen Geist in hohem Maße vereint und indem er den Wahrheitssinn ernster wissenschaftlicher Forscher ehrlich anerkannte, fand er den geeigneten Anknüpfungspunkt zu gemeinsamer Arbeit. Dabei trat ihm auch immer klarer hervor, daß die Frage nach dem Wesen der Religion die eigentliche **Weltanschauungsfrage** aller modern Gebildeten sei. Offenbar folgerte Girgensohn von der notwendigen Einheitlichkeit der Gesamtschöpfung, daß auch unterschiedliche (sichtbare und unsichtbare) Sphären derselben sich nicht widersprechen können. Deshalb bemühte er sich in allen Punkten das zu erzielen, was der Anforderung völliger Harmonie zwischen materieller und pneumatischer Wirklichkeit Genüge leistet. Demnach ist also Girgensohn als Vermittlungstheologe bester Art anzusehen, der im gleichen aufrichtigen Streben nach Erkenntnis der Wahrheit auf religiösem und wissenschaftlichem Gebiet im Grund dasselbe Ziel verfolgt findet. Vgl. W. Grühn: Die Theologie K. Girgensohns; sowie des letzteren Hauptwerk: Der seelische Aufbau des religiösen Erlebens.

Ein ähnliches Ringen um eine einheitliche Weltanschauung kann schwerlich irgendeinem andern ernstlichen Theologen ganz erspart bleiben. War es aber einem Girgensohn vergönnt, wenigstens einem Wissenschaftler den Weg zum Glauben zu ebnen, so werden auch wir uns reichlich belohnt finden, wenn wir, wie Hamann sagt „einem oder dem andern" ihn weisen durften; da bekanntlich der Selbstruhm der meisten Vertreter der heutigen Wissenschaft ein ganz beträchtlicher ist. Dennoch werden hier und da aus diesen Kreisen schon Stimmen laut, die erkennen lassen, daß man auch dort zur Einsicht kommt, daß auf getrenntem Weg das Ziel nicht erreichbar ist.

Soviel ist sicher, daß wir ohne ernstliches Studium, verbunden mit „meditatio et oratio" unsre Studierstube (Sanktum) zur Rumpelkammer pragmatischer Vielgeschäftigkeit entweihen. Im heutigen Streit der Geister vermag nur ein **zeitgemäß gefestigtes Urteil** uns vor der beschämenden Erkenntnis zu bewahren, daß wir durch Versäumnis geistigen Aufbaus selbst Vertretern unhaltbarer Anschauungen nicht sachlich zu begegnen wissen. Dagegen wird jedes nähere Eingehen darauf uns dessen belehren, daß es mit dem Erkennen und Wissen auch der Neuzeit nicht ganz so glänzend bestellt ist, als man uns gern glauben machen will. Die letzten Gründe, Ursachen und Fragen, vor allem, was Leben ist, hat noch kein nur wissenschaftlich Gelehrter beantwortet; noch weniger wird je ein Forscher auch nur Pflanzenleben neuschöpferisch erzeugen können.

Diesen Abschnitt abschließend, möge noch eine Erwägung Platz finden. Soll nämlich eine Weltanschauung in ihren Grundzügen

genügend Ewigkeitsgehalt bergen, um auch revidierende Einzelanordnungen zu überdauern, so muß dieselbe **notwendig christozentrisch** sein. Wird Christus aus dieser ihm allein gebührenden Stellung verschoben, so verlieren Bild und Anschauung ihren Zusammenhang und werden zum unlösbaren Rätsel der ägyptischen Sphinx.

2. Welchen Gewinn böte aber auch die zutreffendste Weltansicht, der keine überzeugungstreue Stellungnahme entspräche? Wohl mag ja dies unsre Absicht sein, in allem **unbedingt Gewissenhaftigkeit** zu beweisen; handeln wir aber auch stets unerschrocken nach unsrer christlichen Ueberzeugung? Paulus sagt: Ich übe mich, ein unverletzt Gewissen allenthalben zu haben, beides gegen Gott und Menschen. Akt. 24, 16. Die Frage eines werten Gastes aus Asien, während der Kriegszeit, nach des Referenten persönlichem Eintreten für seine Ueberzeugung, bewies ihm, daß nicht nur die Augen der Welt auf das Verhalten der amerikanischen Geistlichen gerichtet waren, sondern daß man etwas ganz anderes von uns erwartet hatte, als zu allermeist geschah.

Heute nun, wo z. B. der Urheber bläulicher Büchelchen, Haldeman-Julius, das Dasein Gottes derart leugnet, daß er mittelst einer telegrammatisch ergehenden Debatte sich selbst möglichst ins Bühnenlicht stellt, da wird jeder Geistliche sich fragen dürfen, inwieweit er mit dafür verantwortlich ist, daß 1927 ein amerikanischer Richter wagen durfte — entgegen der zu Gott sich bekennenden Konstitution — einer zur Ausrottung aller Religion etablierten Gesellschaft einen Freibrief auszustellen? Solches hat unsers Wissens weder einen energischen Protest des Richterstandes noch der Kirchenförderation oder auch nur vonseiten der größeren Denominationen des Landes ausgelöst. Bezeugen nicht ferner immer neue Klagen gegen höhere Beamte eine alles zersetzende **Gewissenlosigkeit.** Wenn aber angesichts einer beispiellosen Woge von Gesetzlosigkeit und brutalster Morde, wobei die niederschreitende Altersstufe der Verbrecher besonders bedenklich ist, nicht wenige unsrer Wortführer in unverwüstlichem Optimismus behaupten, wir wären auf bestem Weg, die allen vorbildliche Nation zu werden, so stehen wir vor einem Rätsel der Begriffsverwirrung. Fangen schließlich noch evangelische Geistliche an, so sensationelle „Topiks" anzuzeigen, wie: Gibt es einen Gott? Hat Christus gelebt? und dergleichen, dann ist es fürwahr an der Zeit, solchen bedrohlichen Anzeichen mit allen Mitteln gewissenhafter Amtsführung und in treuer Beweisung des Wahrheitsgeistes zu begegnen. Ja, es gilt gemeinverständlich und in wahrem evangelistischem Geist auch den theatralischen Pseudo-Evangelisten und Revivalisten gegenüber wettzumachen, was jene durch **Profanieren alles Heiligen** verderben. Vgl. B. Sundays: Liebesgeschichten der Bibel. Die erwähnten Erscheinungen sind je-

doch nur Vorboten des kommenden Sturms. Uns droht als folgerichtige Ernte des 1917 in Amerika erklärten und seitdem permanent gewordenen „Kriegszustandes" jener russische Kommunismus, der den gottlosen Materialismus der wahren Kriegsurheber krönt. Jener hat in Rußland alle Schulen zu anti-religiösen Pflanzstätten gemacht, im einzigen Land, wo im Gegensatz zum Beispiel zum französischen Rückgang der Geburtenrate, trotz Bürgerkriegs, Seuchen und Zerstörung der Familie, die Bevölkerung von 1920 bis 1927 um 14 Millionen gewachsen ist. Kinder unter 18 Jahren darf nirgends religiöser Unterricht erteilt werden. In so lästerlicher Weise gehen dort Lehrer behufs Ausrottung der Religion zuwege, daß man versucht ist, daß bekannte Wort derart zu erläutern: Irret euch nicht, Gott läßt sich nicht „dauernd" spotten! Bekanntlich deutete Bengel seinerzeit das Kommen Gogs und Magogs als aus Rußland. Vgl. Russischer Evangelischer Pressedienst, 1928, Nr. 2, Verlag Häcker, Riga.

Trotzdem wird noch immer bei uns behauptet, das alles seien nur gewöhnliche Phasen einer Uebergangszeit, wir lebten in einer **weitgehend liberalen Zeit.** Dies zweifelhafte Lob verdankt dieselbe aber wohl weniger einem Mussolini und Konsorten in der Diktatur, als jenen Zeitgenossen, die dem Sohn Gottes nur „ein im Zeitrahmen seines Erdenlebens begründetes Beschränktsein" zuschreiben. Letzteres scheint dem Referenten besser auf die Funktionen des Gewissens oder der Einsicht solcher Kritiker zuzutreffen, sowie derjenigen „Geistlichen," die bis heute noch nicht zu wissen scheinen, daß z. B. Senator Owen schon längst vor dem Kongreß Deutschland rückhaltlos von der Kriegsschuld freigesprochen und dem Vernichtungswillen seiner Feinde den Stab gebrochen hat. Wie lichtscheu erscheinen dagegen die Schlangenwindungen, mit welchen die amerikanischen Delegaten von Stockholm seinerzeit den deutschen Teilnehmern antworteten, die um des Gewissens willen von ihnen ein Gutachten betreffs der Kriegsschuld erbaten! — O, wie not tut bei uns vor allem eine gründliche Gewissensweckung und dann ein Handeln nach dem Beispiel eines Zachäus. Wie bitter vermißt man „das Gewissen" auf allen Gebieten, auch bei Verwaltung öffentlichen und fremden Eigentums.

So liegt vor allem den Geistlichen ob, das **Volksgewissen zu wecken,** als Grundlage jeder religiösen Erneuerung und dadurch bedingten Hebung der öffentlichen Moral. Da die Hoffnungen völlig gescheitert sind, die man bei uns auf moralische Hebung der Jugend durch erzwungene Mehrung weltlichen Lehrstoffes setzte, muß jene Aufgabe nur um so dringender erscheinen. Gehen wir mit der rechten „Sympathie" an diese hochwichtige Arbeit, so wird der Segen nicht ausbleiben und wir werden so manche zu gewissenhaften, gesetzliebenden Christen erziehen dürfen. Welch ein zartes

Gewissen erhielt sich doch ein **Luther!** Ihm ließ die quälende Frage keine Ruhe: Wie bekomm ich einen gnädigen Gott? — bis er in des Erlösers Person die friedensreiche Antwort fand. Diese aus Gnaden allein ihm widerfahrene Vergebung trieb ihn zur unermüdlichen Bezeugung derselben durch Wort und Tat. Sein Gewissen machte ihn zum Reformator.

Und wir? Soweit wir in Erkenntnis fortgeschritten, sind wir befähigt und verpflichtet, Wahrheit zu zeugen und also auch zur Erfüllung der allerdings göttlicher Korrektive unterstehenden menschlichen Gesetze anzuhalten. Ist die Wahrheit „eine lebendige Tatsache von solcher Gewalt, daß sie auch ohne äußeres Zeugnis von solchen aufgenommen wird, die aus der Wahrheit sind," so werden unserm Zeugnis auch stets neuerweckte Mitstreiter erwachsen. Wohl suchen ja auch unsre Schulen, namentlich durch Verwendung historischer Vorbilder, den kindlichen Willen zur Entscheidung fürs Gute und Edle zu bewegen, doch bleibt es im Grunde Gottes Geist allein, der die Gewissen lenkt und dem Aufrichtigen zum Wollen des Rechten auch das Vollbringen verleiht.

Während Kriegsgetöse täglich die Welt durchbebt, scheint es gar manchen unsrer Mitbürger eine rechte Gewissenssache zu sein, Mittel und Wege zur Verhinderung von Kriegen vorzuschlagen. Doch was will z. B. alles **„Aechten des Krieges"** besagen, kommt es von einer solchen Seite, deren Vertreter ihre vorherigen eifrigsten und so ganz selbstlosen Kriegswünsche durch die Resultate noch weit übertroffen sehen und deren Gewissen in Sachen der Kriegsschuld und der eigenen Mitschuld völlig zu schweigen scheint?

Nur wo Wort und Tat gewissenhaft übereinstimmen und wir für unsre Ueberzeugung zu jedem Opfer bereit sind, nimmt man uns wirklich ernst und wird unserm Wirken bleibender Segen beschert. Richten wir unsern Zeugenberuf gewissenhaft aus, dann mögen die baltischen und asiatischen Märtyrer unsrer Zeit nicht allzulang mehr allein dastehen. Bei entschiedener Geltendmachung der einzig uns möglichen Position gegenüber den großen Weltlügen und der gesetzlosen Ungerechtigkeit unsrer Zeit kann **Widerspruch,** der zu tödlichem Haß ausreifen mag, nicht ganz ausbleiben; wie solches überhaupt noch keinem erspart wurde, der für die Wahrheit unerwünschter Tatsachen und unbedingtes Ueben der Gerechtigkeit kategorisch und katonisch einstand. Wie aber einst dem Elia werden auch uns die 7000 Mitzeugen nicht fehlen, deren opferwilliges Weiterzeugen uns das „Allem absagen," vgl. Luk. 14, 33, erleichtert. Das „Wehe, wenn euch die Leute wohlreden," bleibt ein besserer Wegweiser, als die treulose Gunst der Masse, die heute z. B. nicht den noch viel Raumbietenden Kirchen, sondern einem B. Sunday und ähnlichen zuströmt, denen die vulgär

verkündete Gottseligkeit einträglicher ist, wie den allermeisten Ballspiel, Preiskampf und ähnliche nationale Götzenspiele, die dem hiesigen Publikum das alte „panem et Circenses" ersetzen. Weil der Genannte Kirche und Geistliche, zumal die gastgebenden, greulich durch die Hechel zieht, und alles Geheiligte durch seinen Gassenton profaniert, nehmen seine Hörer auch das Geißeln moderner Laster von „Männlein und Weiblein" mit in den Kauf. Trotzdem er sich auch im prophezeien erprobte und den Weltuntergang in wenigen Jahren ansagte, ersparten ihm die Zeitungen sogar den sonst üblichen Titel eines Unglücksheulers, da er bekanntlich besonders groß im Reklamemachen ist.

Obige Ausführungen, so sagen wir abschließend, bilden einen Weckruf zu unbedingter Gewissenhaftigkeit in Behauptung und Geltendmachung der uns zugewiesenen Position. Den Geistlichen unsrer Zeit obliegt es, ein neues Menetekel in die Herzen der Hörer zu prägen, ja einen Warnruf für die ganze betörte Nation vor den hereinbrechenden Wogen materialistischen Unglaubens. Es gilt allen das wahre **Heimatslicht in Christo** zu weisen und die Gnadenmittel seiner Kirche allen zugänglich zu machen; dann wird das Evangelium vom auferstandenen Gekreuzigten auch an allen, die aus der Wahrheit sind, seine lebenerneuernde Gotteskraft beweisen.

„Und sie bewegt sich doch!" — Auch aller Einsteinschen Relativität zum Trotz, drücken jene einem Galilei zugeschriebenen Worte für uns nicht nur die Tatsache göttlich geordneter Sonnumkreisung vonseiten der Erde aus, sondern auch die damit irgendwie unlösbar verbundene fortschreitende Erweiterung des geistigen Horizonts ihrer denkenden Bewohner. Diesem Umstand haben wir gebührende Rechnung zu tragen, bis wir die durch Zeitschranken und Stückwerk uns gesetzte Periode der Unvollkommenheit durchlaufen haben und allen aufrichtigen Wahrheitssuchern die zeitlosen Aeonen sich auftun, wo volle einheitliche Erkenntnis — vielleicht auch in aufsteigender Weise und zunehmendem Maße — wirklich erreichbar und das Unzulängliche ihnen zum Ereignis wird: Denn wir werden Ihn sehen, wie Er ist.

Die positive Theologie des neunzehnten und zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts.

Von Prof. Dr. R. H. Grützmacher.

Der Altprotestantismus wird in der neueren Theologiegeschichte nicht nur durch die konfessionelle Theologie vertreten, sondern auch durch eine positive Theologie, die vor allem auf die Bibel sich beruft, teils um deren Gehalt möglichst einfach und ungewandelt in der theologischen Erkenntnis wiederzugeben, teils um ihn spekulativ mit dem Weltwissen der Zeit auseinanderzusetzen und zu verbinden. Diese positive Theologie hat geschichtlich festumrissene Formen gewonnen: I. in **der positiven Vermittlungstheologie**, II. **der biblischen Theologie**, III. **der positiven Theologie der Gegenwart.**

I.

Die positive Vermittlungstheologie.

Neben die konfessionelle Theologie trat seit dem ersten Drittel des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts die sogenannte **positive Vermittlungstheologie.** Konnte jene sich auf Luther, so kann diese sich auf Melanchthon berufen und zwar hinsichtlich ihrer wissenschaftlichen wie kirchenpolitischen Tendenzen. Wie Melanchthon kommt es auf die **Verbindung von Vernunft und Offenbarung, Philosophie und Theologie** und in der kirchlichen Sphäre auf Unionen an. Zuförderst aber ist ihrer vermittelnden Stellungnahme auf dem **Gebiete der biblischen und historischen Theologie** zu gedenken. Auf der einen Seite stand Strauß und Baur, welche Echtheit und Glaubwürdigkeit der neutestamentlichen Schriften weitgehend bestritten, auf der andern Seite stand die Ablehnung jeder Kritik — prinzipiell auf Seiten der Repristinationstheologie und faktisch auch in der älteren Erlanger Theologie. Demgegenüber suchte eine große Anzahl von Vertretern der alt- und neutestamentlichen Disziplinen, besonders in Halle und Berlin, wie **Neander, Beyschlag** und **B. Weiß** zwischen Kritik und traditioneller Ueberlieferung zu vermitteln.

Auf streng wissenschaftlich historischem Weg erwies man die Echtheit der meisten neutestamentlichen Schriften etwa mit Ausnahme der Pastoralbriefe und des zweiten Petrusbriefes. Auf Grund dieser Quellen schrieb man **„Leben Jesu."** In ihnen wurden die meisten Wunder und Heilstatsachen für glaubwürdig erklärt. Jesus erscheint als der gottgesandte Lehrer und Messias, vor allem als der Sündlose und als der speziell auserwählte Gegenstand der göttlichen Liebe, der als solcher Sohn Gottes war. Am altkirchlichen apostolischen **Bekenntnis** hielt man mit wenigen Abstrichen wie Jungfrauengeburt und Höllenfahrt fest; Nicänum und Athanasianum stellte man zurück. Von den reformatorischen Bekenntnissen bevorzugte man die Augustana und zwar die Va-

riata; die Konkordienformel lehnte man ab. Luther wurde von Melanchthon aus interpretiert; seine schroffe Stellung nicht nur in der Abendmahlslehre, sondern auch in der Prädestinationslehre möglichst gemildert. Diese Auffassung vertrat besonders der Hallenser Theologe **Köstlin** in seiner Biographie und Theologie Luthers. Denn fast alle Vertreter der Vermittlungstheologie sind zugleich Anhänger der 1817 in Preußen und in einigen andern deutschen Staaten geschlossenen **Union** zwischen der lutherischen und reformierten Kirche. Infolgedessen konzentrierten sie sich auch in der Theologie auf die beiden Konfessionen gemeinsamen Hauptdogmen.

In der **systematischen Theologie** suchte dieser theologische Typus zwischen Theologie und Philosophie, zwischen Vernunft und Offenbarung, Glauben und Wissen und auf ethischem Gebiet zwischen christlicher Ethik und humaner Kultur eine Synthese herzustellen. Dabei knüpfte sie neben dem späteren Schelling an die sogenannte **theistische Philosophie** an. Diese wurde von einer Reihe von Philosophen vertreten, wie den jüngeren J. H. Fichte, Weiße, Chalybäus. Die Vermittlungstheologie glaubte durch Verbindung mit dieser Philosophie Glauben und Wissen überhaupt harmonisiert zu haben. Denn das war ihr Grundziel. Die seit 1828 erscheinende führende Zeitschrift der Vermittlungstheologie „Theologische Studien und Kritiken" formulierte als Programm: „So wenig es eine wahrhaft christliche Theologie ohne christlichen Glauben geben kann, ebenso sicher ist eine die edle Gottesgabe der Vernunft und Wissenschaft erachtende Theologie ein Unding. **Alles wahre Gedeihen der Theologie hängt davon ab, daß sich Glaube und Wissen in ihr befreunden und einander durchdringen.**"

Der eigentliche Systematiker der positiven Vermittlungstheologie war der Berliner Theologe **J. A. Dorner** (1809—1884), der ein großes „System der christlichen Glaubenslehre" (1. Auflage 1879) veröffentlichte. Er wollte in der Grundlegung den Weg zeigen, wie es zur **Gewißheit** des christlichen Glaubens kommt. Der moderne Mensch wird zunächst zweifelhaft an dem traditionellen historischen Glauben. Er wendet sich dann rein geschichtslosen Idealen zu. Aber auch diese können ihn nicht befriedigen und wahre religiöse Gewißheit geben. Das geschieht erst, wenn er sich dem Christentum zuwendet, in dem das Ideale und Geschichtliche verbunden ist. Allein zu diesem theoretischem Weg muß entscheiden der sittlich religiös-praktische treten. Denn den Inhalt des Evangeliums bestimmte Dorner — durchaus biblisch-altprotestantisch — als eine Botschaft, „die alle Selbstrechtfertigung des Sünders verwirft, aber auch die Selbstverurteilung wie bestätigt so in göttliche Vergebung umsetzt und dem Glauben an Christus Gewißheit der Rechtfertigung verheißt." — Auch in der speziellen **Dogmatik** vertritt Dorner in allen Grundfragen das

alte Dogma. Er sucht es nur wie die Trinität und die **Gottmenschheit** dem Verstand durch **spekulative Gedankengänge** zugänglicher zu machen. Damit eine wirkliche persönliche Lebenseinheit im Gottmenschen Christus begreiflich werde, läßt er die Einigung während des Lebens allmählich zunehmen. Entsprechend der wachsenden Empfänglichkeit der Menschheit Jesu, wohnt sich ihr der Logos immer tiefer ein, sodaß der gottmenschliche Einigungsprozeß erst am Schluß des irdischen Lebens Jesu vollendet ist." „In Christus ist mit dem Werden der menschlichen Seite notwendig auch ein Werden der Gottmenschheit gegeben und die Menschwerdung ist nicht als eine mit einem Mal fertige, sondern als fortgehende, ja wachsende zu denken, indem Gott als Logos jede der neuen Seiten, die von der wahren menschlichen Entwicklung hervorgebildet waren, stetig ergreift und sich aneignet, wie umgekehrt die wachsende aktuelle Empfänglichkeit der Menschheit mit immer neuen Seiten des Logos sich bewußt und wollend zusammenschließt." Diese Theorie stellt neben der kenotischen Christologie, die Dorner lebhaft bekämpft, den originellsten spekulativen Versuch einer Verständlichmachung der Gottmenschheit Jesu in der neueren Theologie dar.

Ein weiterer Systematiker der positiven Vermittlungstheologie, **Julius Müller** in Halle (1801—1828) hat in einer Monographie über „Die christliche Lehre von der **Sünde**" (1. Auflage 1844, dann noch fünf Auflagen) sein Gesamtverständnis des Christentums dargelegt.

Auch für die Behandlung des Sündenproblems erscheinen neben biblisch-christlichen spekulativ-philosophische Gedankengänge als nötig. Die Sünde ist im innersten Wesen Selbstsucht; als solche die sich selbst verkehrende Freiheit. In dieser muß die Sünde ihre Ursache haben, da sie auf Gott nicht zurückgeführt werden kann. Der sündige Mißbrauch der Freiheit hat „seinen Anfang im Gebiet des Außerzeitlichen, in welchem allein eine unbedingte Selbstbestimmung möglich ist." Die innerweltliche Determination durch die Sünde soll die Folge einer eigenen vorweltlichen Selbstbestimmung zum Bösen sein. Damit nimmt Müller Theorien auf, wie sie im indischen Denken, sodann bei Origines und in philosophischer Form bei Kant sich geltend machten. Zuletzt muß jedoch auch Müller anerkennen, daß eine wirkliche Erklärung des Bösen auch auf diesem Weg nicht gegeben ist: „Das Böse ist seinem Wesen nach das Unbegreifliche, das Böse ist das unergründliche Geheimnis der Welt; in seiner innersten Tiefe bleibt es immer undurchdringliche Finsternis." **Die versuchte Rationalisierung der Sünde endet bei Müller mit der Anerkennung ihrer Irrationalität.**

Die Stellung der positiven Vermittlungstheorie zur **Christlichen Ethik in ihrem Verhältnis zur Kultur** ist deutlicher als in deutschen Werken in der vielverbreiteten Ethik des dänischen Theo-

logen **Martensen** zum Ausdruck gekommen, der in engster Verbindung mit der deutschen Vermittlungstheologie besonders Dorners stand. In dieser Ethik erscheinen alle Spannungen zwischen Christentum und Kultur leicht zu überwinden. Das christliche Ethos reinigt und vollendet die innerweltlichen Kulturschöpfungen besonders auch die Kunst und die verschiedenen Sozialformen. Martensen wandelt stark in den Bahnen der Schleiermacher-Rotheschen **Kulturethik.**

II.

Die biblische Theologie.

Soweit der Altprotestantismus nichts anders sein will, als Wiedererweckung der biblischen Wahrheit, beansprucht im 19. Jahrhundert seine Vertretung die „Biblische Theologie." Sie verwirft im Prinzip jede Anlehnung an irgendeine Philosophie, die Hegelsche so gut wie die Kantsche, die Schellingsche nicht minder als die theistische. Sie will das außerchristliche und sonderlich das moderne Geistesleben überhaupt nicht berücksichtigen. Spekulation ist ihr ebenso fremd wie die Ausbildung einer christlichen Weltanschauung oder auf ethischem Gebiet die Schöpfung einer christlichen Kultur. Aber auch die kirchlich-dogmatische Entwicklung, soweit sie über die Bibel hinausgeht und durch philosophische Ideen bedingt ist, will sie nicht berücksichtigen. Darum sind ihr wenigstens die inner-protestantisch-konfessionellen Gegensätze gleichgültig und den Katholizismus lehnt sie nur wegen seiner mangelnden biblischen Begründung ab. Durch diese Stellungnahme unterscheidet sie sich deutlich von der neueren konfessionellen Theologie. Endlich verwirft sie auch die Erfahrung als Quelle und Ausgangspunkt der christlichen Wahrheitserkenntnis im Sinn Schleiermachers und der Erlanger. Diesem Subjektivismus setzt sie die objektive Norm der Bibel entgegen.

Ueber das Grundprinzip dieses theologischen Typus hat sich sein originellster Vertreter Tobias **Beck** in Tübingen (1804—1878) ausgesprochen. Er selbst gab eine „Einleitung in das System der christlichen Lehre" (1837) und „Die christliche Lehrwissenschaft nach den biblischen Urkunden" (1840) heraus. Bei ihm heißt es: „Alles wahrhaft christliche Erkennen ist wesentlich dadurch bedingt, daß es die in der heiligen Schrift niedergelegte Lehre als die vollendete und vollendende Wahrheit zum ausschließlichen Gegenstand hat; sie bildet das eine und ganze religiöse Erkenntnisgebiet für die Christen und den positiven Lehrinhalt aller christlichen Erkenntnis und Wissenschaft. Alles nicht biblisch Gegebene hat für das christliche Erkennen auf dem religiösen Gebiet keine objektive Wahrheitsbedeutung." Die Auffassung der Bibel nähert sich stark der Orthodoxen des 17. Jahrhunderts, will aber doch auch den Fortschritt der Offenbarungserkenntnis berücksichtigen. Eigentlicher Inhalt der Bibel und damit auch des christlichen Lehrsystems soll

nach Beck die *βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν* sein. Dieses soll aber nicht nur einen idealen Zustand der Christen bezeichnen, auch nicht einen kirchlichen Organismus, oder ein sonstiges geschichtliches Produkt. **Das Gottesreich** ist vielmehr ein real bei Gott vor Erschaffung der Welt existierendes „selbständig bestehendes Reich, ein organisiertes Lebenssystem." Vornehmlich in Christus ist es in die Geschichte eingetreten, um durch ihn in der Welt fortzuwirken; aber erst am Ende der Welt wird es als neue ewig dauernde Weltform in die Erscheinung treten. Das Christentum bringt einen „neuen Lebenstypus." Mit dieser Formel deutet Beck seine stark moralische Auffassung des Christentums an. Dieses neue Leben wird dem Einzelnen durch die **Rechtfertigung** zu teil. Diese stellt ein „gerechtes Personenverhältnis zu Gott in Christo dar und gibt damit eine Naturdisposition für ein entsprechendes gerechtes Verhalten." Religiöse Rechtfertigung ist danach für Beck zwar nicht einfach identisch mit sittlicher Wiedergeburt, aber das eigentliche Ziel der Rechtfertigung ist doch die Wiedergeburt. — In allen diesen Gedankengängen Becks wird man keineswegs eine reine Wiedergabe der biblischen Gedankenwelt erkennen. Im Gegenteil hat Beck theosophische Ideen wie sie sich etwa bei Jakob Böhme oder andern schwäbischen Theosophen finden in biblische Begriffe wie die Reichsgottesidee eingetragen und so auch seinerseits die Theologie mit einer Philosophie verbunden. Die Rechtfertigungslehre hat er nicht paulinisch-altprotestantisch, sondern eher katholisch-moralistisch verstanden. Trotzdem ist festzustellen, daß Beck an vielen Stellen wie etwa bei der Eschatologie biblische Vollbegriffe wieder in die christliche Lehrwissenschaft eingefügt hat.

In der **Ethik** erklärt er es für unmöglich die Welt und ihre sozialen Formen zu christianisieren. Es läßt sich nur eine christliche Lebensordnung für die Subjekte innerhalb der menschlichen Gesellschaftskreise aufstellen. Diese selbst sind nur „göttliche Gesetzes- und Zuchtinstitute für das Weltleben zur Ordnung der irdischen Entwicklung der Menschheit." Erst die Eschatologie wird mit der Umschaffung der gesamten Natur und Welt auch dem Christentum konforme Gesellschaftsformen bringen. Beck steht mithin in schärfstem Gegensatz zu aller innerweltlichen Kulturethik.

Ein andrer Vertreter des Biblizismus **H. Cremer** (1834—1903) in Greifswald machte auch zum Inhalt des biblischen Christentums die **Rechtfertigung.** Aber er verstand sie ganz im Paulinischen Sinn. Es handelt sich in ihr um die rein religiöse, völlig paradoxe Gerechterklärung des Sünders im Gegensatz zu seinem sittlichen Zustand und ohne Rücksicht auf dessen etwaige Aenderung. „Es gibt nichts Paradoxeres, nichts, was so sehr das Gegenteil ist zu allem, was logisch und sittlich folgerichtig ist als die Versöhnung, die Erlösung, die Vergebung all unsrer Sünden, die tat-

sächlich göttliche Vergebung, Anrechnung der Sünden und doch Vergebung."

Dieser Glaube ist es auch, auf welchen nach Cremer der **Wahrheitsbeweis für das Christentum** ruht. Der natürliche Mensch erfährt Gott im Gewissen als Richter, das Christentum bestätigt diesen Eindruck, lehrt aber zugleich parador im Richtergott den Rettergott erkennen: „Es ist der Gott des Gerichts, den wir in dem Gott des Heils wiedererkennen und darum anerkennen. An seinem sich gleichbleibenden Verhältnis zur Sünde erkennen wir ihn."

Auch ein dritter Theologe macht die **Rechtfertigung** zum Kern des Christentums, **Martin Kähler** (1835—1912). Er nimmt sie darum schon in den Titel seines Werkes auf: „Die Wissenschaft der christlichen Lehre von dem evangelischen Grundartikel aus im Abrisse dargestellt." (Dritte Auflage, 1905). Kähler bringt in diesem Buch eine reiche und originale Fülle biblischer Gedanken, die er aber — in der Nachfolge Hofmanns — in heilsgeschichtliche Ordnung einreiht. Er gibt auch dem kirchlichen Bekenntnis Raum und betont stark den „Erfahrungsbeweis im eigenen Leben" und das subjektive Rechtfertigungserlebnis. Endlich benutzt er bei der Ausgestaltung christlicher Dogmen wie der Dreieinigkeit und Gottmenschheit eine gewisse Spekulation.

Aber gerade Kähler hat das Verständnis für die Bedeutung der **Bibel** und ihren zentralen Inhalt außerordentlich gefördert. Er hat den Hofmannschen Gedanken eines kirchengeschichtlichen Beweises für die Bibel weiter ausgeführt: „Neben das ‚testimonium spiritus sancti internum in singulis' tritt ein gleiches ‚testimonium in ecclesia.' Man sollte erfahren: Was hat die Christenheit sowohl in ihren einzelnen Gliedern als in ihren umfassenden kirchlichen Entwicklungen von der Bibel gehabt und von ihr empfangen."

Als zentraler Inhalt der Bibel erschien Kähler der **biblische Christus.** Für diesen trat er ein im Gegensatz zu dem zu seiner Zeit herrschenden „Leben Jesu" und dem „Historischen Jesus." Er tat das in der Schrift: „Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche biblische Christus." Zum biblischen Christus als Inhalt des Glaubens gehört nicht nur „die erzählende Beschreibung seines Charakters, wie er sie in seinen Handlungen gezeigt und in seinen Erlebnissen behauptet hat, sondern durchaus auch die Darlegung seiner Berufstellung als Messias; demgemäß hat ein vollständiges Zeugnis seine maßgebende und ausreichende Quelle lediglich in der Zusammenfassung der sogenannten Evangelien mit den übrigen neutestamentlichen Schriften und der alttestametlichen Bibel." „Der auferstandene Herr ist nicht der historische Jesus hinter den Evangelien, sondern der Christus der apostolischen Predigt des ganzen Neuen Testaments." „Christus selbst ist der Urheber des biblischen Bildes."

Kähler kommt das nicht geringe Verdienst zu, die Unhaltbarkeit der neuprotestantischen Jesusauffassung nachgewiesen und an ihre Stelle wieder das altprotestantische Christusbild gesetzt zu haben.

III.

Positive Theologie im 20. Jahrhundert.

1. Je näher man der unmittelbaren Gegenwart kommt, umso schwieriger ist eine Darstellung, die auf wirklich geschichtlichem Charakter Anspruch erheben kann. Denn Alles erscheint noch im Fluß und das wirklich Bleibende kann erst die Zukunft feststellen. Das gilt in besonderm Maße von der theologischen Lage in Deutschland im ersten Viertel des 20. Jahrhunderts. Mit Recht sagt Ihmels: „Wir wissen alle bis zu welchem Maß, — man möchte fast sagen — alles in der Theologie gegenwärtig im Fluß ist. Auch die Arbeit der wissenschaftlichen Theologie trägt in weitem Umfang etwas von Uebergangscharakter an sich. Alle Erkenntnisse, die vielleicht allgemein als gesichert gelten, sind ins Wanken geraten. Jedenfalls suchen wir nach neuen Erkenntnissen und haben selbst am lebhaftesten die Empfindung, wie wenig wir Menschen der Gegenwart mit diesem Suchen schon bei festen Zielen angelangt sind." („Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung," 1914, S. 556.) Dementsprechend kann es sich nur darum handeln, die wichtigsten Ansätze zur Neugestaltung der Theologie und zwar der positiven zu charakterisieren.

Auf biblischem Gebiet sowohl des Alten und des Neuen Testaments treten eine ganze Anzahl von Gelehrten für die wesentliche Glaubwürdigkeit der biblischen Ueberlieferung ein. Sie berücksichtigen dabei durchaus die literarkritischen Probleme und die religionsgeschichtlichen Fragestellungen. Die relativ späte Niederschrift einer Nachricht spricht nicht gegen deren Richtigkeit und eine streng durchgeführte religionsgeschichtliche Vergleichung läßt umso deutlicher die Eigenart der biblischen Religion erkennen. Dagegen wird der Einfluß eines religionsgeschichtlichen Evolutionismus und einer religionsphilosophischen Dogmatik auf die biblische Forschung entschieden abgelehnt. (So die Stellungnahme von Männern auf alttestamentlichem Gebiet wie Kittel, König, Köberle †, besonders Sellin und der Mitarbeiter seines Kommentarwerkes; auf neutestamentlichem Gebiet Th. Zahn und der Mitarbeiter seines Kommentares, Heinrici †, Feine, Schlatter, Lütgert, E. Weber, Deißner, Schmitz.)

Die **kirchliche Reformation** wird im Gegensatz zu den neuprotestantischen Konstruktionen in erster Linie als eine Erneuerung der biblischen Erlösungsreligion aufgefaßt. Sie unterscheidet sich bestimmt vom Katholizismus, indem sie die in ihn eingedrungenen

Elemente der Natur- und Gesetzesreligion ausscheidet. Die Reformation kann sich auch durchaus in dem sogenannten modernen Geistesleben behaupten, zumal in diesem bei genauerer Analyse eine weitgehende Abhängigkeit von vorchristlich-antiken und vorreformatorisch-mittelalterlichen Ideen sichtbar wird. Zwischen der idealistischen Philosophie der neuern Zeit und der reformatorischen Erlösungsreligion besteht allerdings ein prinzipieller Gegensatz. (So die Stellungnahme von Männern wie W. Walther †, Kunze †, H. H. Böhmer †, Preuß, Holl †, Hirsch, Elert, R. H. Grützmacher, Dunkmann, Lütgert.)

2. Dieses in den geschichtlichen Urkunden der Schrift, dem reformatorischen Bekenntnis wie in der lebendigen religiösen Erfahrung als Erlösungsreligion gegebene Christentum, will die positive **systematische Theologie** mit den wissenschaftlichen Methoden der Gegenwart verstehen und begründen, ohne es inhaltlich von dem sogenannten modernen Geistesleben umgestalten zu lassen.

Das ist in verschiedener Weise von den — jetzt kurz zu den charakterisierenden — einzelnen Theologen versucht worden. **Schäder,** Breslau (geb. 1861) behauptet in seiner „Theozentrische Theologie" (1909 ff.), daß sämtliche theologische Richtungen des 19. Jahrhunderts und zwar nicht bloß Schleiermacher, Ritschl, die religionsgeschichtliche Theologie, sondern auch die Erlanger und die Biblizisten anthroprozentrisch gerichtet gewesen seien. Sie hätten alle den Menschen und sein Heilsbedürfnis einseitig in den Vordergrund gerückt und Gottes Liebe nur als Mittel zur menschlichen Erlösung verstanden. Im Gegensatz dazu will Schäder eine **Theozentrische Theologie** entwerfen. In ihr steht Gottes Majestät, die sich auch außer Christus in Natur und Geschichte offenbart hat, im Mittelpunkt. Unser Für-Gott-sein als dienende Organe der göttlichen Herrschaft wird stärker betont als Gottes Für-uns-sein in seiner vergebenden Gnade in Christus. Schäder erklärt selbst: „Es ist klar, daß bei einer derartigen Orientierung der Theologie unvergängliche Erkenntnisse des Kalvinismus für die christlich-kirchliche Glaubenslehre fruchtbar gemacht werden."

Gerade im Unterschied zu Schäder will **Schlatter** (geb. 1852), der vor allen Dingen durch seine Lebensarbeit das Verständnis der Bibel gefördert hat, in seinem „Das christliche Dogma" (1911) eine beobachtende empirische Methode anwenden. Diese soll zunächst anthropologisch-psychologische Beobachtungen sammeln und aus ihnen auf dem Weg des kausalen Rückschlusses das Wesen Gottes erfassen. Schlatter schließt sich hier wesentlich der Erlanger Methode, besonders Franks an. „Die Theologische Arbeit besteht immer in der Beobachtung des Menschen. Insofern bleibt jede Theologie gerade dann, wenn sie ernsthaft in Gott ihren Gegenstand hat, anthropozentrisch, weil sie ihren Standort nicht über, sondern im Menschen

hat." Die Gedanken über Gott soll die Theologie selbständig — ohne Rücksicht auf eine besondre Philosophie und ohne sich durch die Erkenntnistheorie Kants hindern zu lassen — entwickeln. Schlatter verlangt eine theologische Spekulation, die bei aller Originalität und starker Befruchtung durch die Bibel an neuere theosophische Denker wie den ausdrücklich genannten Baader anknüpft. Bei den einzelnen Dogmen kommt Schlatter im Wesentlichen der altprotestantischen Anschauung nahe. Auch für besonders angefochtene Dogmen wie die Teufelslehre und die Kindertaufe tritt er ein. In seiner **Ethik** verlangt Schlatter mit der Energie der reformierten Konfession die Verwendung der aus der Religion sich egebenden Motive zum aktiven Dienst in der christlichen Gemeinschaft und dann im weltlichen Beruf.

L. Lemme (1847—1922) hat sich zunächst durch scharfe Kritik an der Ritschlschen Theologie bekannt gemacht und sodann drei große Systeme „Christliche Ethik" (1905 ff.), „Christliche Glaubenslehre" (1918 ff.), „Christliche Apologetik" (1922) veröffentlicht. „Die Glaubenslehre hat die religiösen Erlebnisse des christlichen Glaubens in wissenschaftlicher Reflexion auf die innere Erfahrung zu beschreiben." Sie hat zu entfalten erstens: das Wesen des Glaubens, zweitens: die objektiven Voraussetzungen des Glaubens, drittens: die Entwicklung des Glaubenslebens. Der Inhalt der religiösen Erfahrung wird in spezifisch christlich-pietistischer Bestimmtheit als **Wiedergeburt und Bekehrung** aufgefaßt. Gerade aus ihr ergibt sich aber die Erkenntnis Christi als Sohnes Gottes. Die Glaubenslehre führt jedoch nur zu einer „empirisch-religiösen Christologie." Diese wird durch eine spekulative Christologie in der Apologetik ergänzt, denn die **Apologetik** hat eine theologische Metaphysik, eine spekulative Theologie zu entfalten. Diese soll der denkenden Vernunft im Christentum die befriedigende Lösung aller Welträtsel nachweisen.

Während Lemme sich in seiner Glaubenslehre wesentlich in den Bahnen der Erlanger Erfahrungstheologie bewegt, folgt er in seiner Apologetik der spekulativen Vermittlungstheologie und auch Rothe. In seiner alle konkreten Fragen behandelnden **Ethik** bringt Lemme die antiphilosophische, speziell antikantische Eigenart der christlichen Sittlichkeit zu sehr scharfem Ausdruck. In ihr liegt der Antrieb zur Christianisierung der Welt und ihrer Sozialordnungen.

Eine Verbindung zwischen Theologie und Philosophie will **Stange**, Göttingen (geb. 1870), herstellen. Er tut das durch eine Reihe von Schriften zur **Religionsphilosophie**, welche ihm diejenige wissenschaftliche Disziplin ist, „durch welche sich der Zusammenhang der Theologie mit der Philosophie vermittelt." In komplizierten Gedankengängen sucht er nachzuweisen, daß das Problem der Religion nicht als zufällige Erscheinung auftaucht, sondern notwendig

im menschlichen Bewußtsein gegeben ist. Wirkliche Religion erwächst allerdings erst aus praktischer Erfahrung und gibt den allgemeinen blassen Kathegorien des Religiösen den anschaulich konkreten Inhalt der übersinnlichen Macht, des unendlichen Geistes und des unbedingten Willens. Mit dem Begriff der Offenbarung ist die Grenze der religionsphilosophischen Erörterungen erreicht. Von Offenbarung im eigentlichen Sinn kann nur in einer einzigen Religion, im Christentum geredet werden. Der entscheidende Inhalt der christlichen Offenbarung ist Christi Person. In ihrer näheren Bestimmung wie in der Erledigung dogmatischer Einzelprobleme folgt Stange wesentlich altprotestantisch-lutherischen Gedankengängen.

3. Während die bisher behandelten Theologen entweder reine Systematiker sind oder von der biblischen Theologie herkommen, nimmt **Reinhold Seeberg,** Berlin (geb. 1859), von der Geschichte und zwar von der **Dogmengeschichte** seinen Ausgangspunkt. Er hat das umfänglichste, an Stoffreichtum noch Harnack übertreffende, ganz aus den Quellen erarbeitete „Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte" (3. Auflage, 1922 ff.) veröffentlicht. In einer im Erscheinen begriffenen **Dogmatik** (Band I, 1927) wird er seine theologische Position in geschlossenem Zusammenhang darlegen. Besonders original ist seine Leistung auf dem Gebiet der mittelalterlichen Dogmengeschichte, deren große Bedeutung er gerade auch für das Verständnis der reformatorischen Dogmengeschichte erwiesen hat. „Das Dogma ist eine besondre Ausdrucksform der Erkenntnis der Gemeinde von der Heilswahrheit und zwar handelt es sich um solche Erkenntnisse, die die Gemeinde als schlechthin notwendig für ihren geschichtlichen Bestand angesehen hat und darum durch öffentliche Fixierung zu einem dauernden Faktor dieses Bestandes gemacht hat. So versteht sich sowohl der rechtliche als der kirchliche und der religiöse Charakter des Dogmas." Die Dogmengeschichte ist kirchliche Ideengeschichte. Sie ist aber nicht — wie die ältere unter Hegels Einfluß stehende Dogmengeschichtsschreibung meinte — geradlinig verlaufen; sie ist aber auch nicht im Sinn Harnacks im Grund nur eine Verderbung des urchristlichen Evangeliums. „Es steht aber nicht so, daß diese Entwicklung eine gradlinige ist, so daß Dogma an Dogma sich konsequent anschließt. Man muß sich sagen, daß jedes Dogma von einem bestimmten Gesichtspunkt her, das ganze Christentum als Erlösungsreligion beschreibt. Sie hat aber nicht nur historisch zu schildern, sondern die Formulierung jedes Dogmas daraufhin zu prüfen, ob sie den vom Urchristentum repräsentierten reinen Typus der Erlösungsreligion entspricht." Infolgedessen gibt Seeberg am Anfang seiner Dogmengeschichte eine kurze Inhaltsbestimmung der urchristlichen Erlösungsreligion. Die **Reformation** ist für ihn eine besondre Entwicklungsstufe des Pauli-

nismus und Augustinismus im Verständnis des germanischen Geistes.

In seiner erstmalig 1900 erschienen „Die Kirche Deutschlands im 19. Jahrhundert" erhebt er die Forderung einer **modernen positiven Theologie,** „die den besondern Bedürfnissen des modernen Menschen und der geistigen Lage der Zeit entspricht." Er hat sie zunächst in einer populären Schrift „Die Grundwahrheiten der christlichen Religion" (1. Auflage, 1907) zu erfüllen gesucht, dann aber in einer wesentlich weiter entwickelten und umgestalteten Form in **„Christliche Glaubenslehre"** (I. Band, 1924; II. Band, 1925). Am Schluß des ganzen Werkes stellt Seeberg selbst eine Beziehung seiner Denkweise fest „zu dem deutschen Idealismus, wie er sich in seinen beiden maßgebenden Vertretern Kant und Hegel darstellt, und zugleich die Ablehung der Erkentnislehre wie der Metaphysik der Griechen, der orthodoxen Scholastik und Aufklärung auch in allen ihren modernen Ausläufern." (II., 670.) Er stellt die Vermutung in entschiedene Abrede, als ob dadurch die christlichen Grundgedanken umgedeutet und um ihren eigentlichen Gehalt gebracht würden: „Wir haben uns bemüht das ganze unverkürzte und unverfälschte Christentum zur Darstellung zu bringen. Aber wir mußten das so tun, daß wir uns nicht bei der Reproduktion von biblischen Sprüchen oder alten kirchlichen Theorien beruhigten, sondern das Christentum als die lebendige Religion, die aus dem Geist Gottes ist und zu ihm führt, zu erfassen trachten und wir mußten endlich die besten und sichersten Methoden zum Verständnis geistiger Verhältnisse in Anwendung bringen, die uns zugänglich waren. in der Ueberzeugung, daß man auf diesem Weg die Tiefe des Christentums am ehesten ausschöpfen und es dem Bedarf unsrer Zeit entsprechend ausdrücken würde. In diesem Sinn war es gemeint, wenn wir auch die formalen Mittel und die allgemeine geistige Einstellung der idealistischen Philosophie zu unserm Zweck benutzt haben." (II., 675.) Das Grundprinzip seiner dogmatischen Neuformulierung bezeichnet Seeberg als einen „voluntaristischen Transzendentalismus." „Gegenüber der alten dinglichen Auffassung des göttlichen und menschlichen Geistes, wird der Wille als das charakteristische Element des menschlichen und göttlichen Geistes, und darum auch das Verhältnis beider zu einander als ein Willensverhältnis bestimmt." (Vorrede zu Band II.)

Im ersten Teil seiner Dogmatik bestimmt Seeberg zunächst auf Grund einer religionsgeschichtlichen Phänomenologie die **Religion:** „Sie ist nach ihrer objektiven Seite die von Gott in dem Menschengeist gewirkte Unterwerfung unter Gottes Willen, und sie ist, subjektiv angesehen, der Gehorsam wider Gott in rezeptiv aufnehmenden und in aktiv aufsuchendem Sinn." (I., 77.) Nachdem noch die apriorische Anlage zur Religion und ihr Verhältnis

zur Kultur bestimmt ist, wendet sich Seeberg der Wesensbestimmung des **Christentums** zu. „In den beiden Begriffspaaren der erlösenden Gottesherrschaft und des Glaubens, des Reiches Gottes und der Liebe ist das Wesen des Christentums ausgedrückt." (I., 1607.) Diese Gottesherrschaft ist in der Geschichte, wie in der Gegenwart durch Jesum Christum vermittelt. Durch eine religionsphilosophisch apologetische Untersuchung erweist Seeberg, daß das Christentum „die absolute Religion im Sinne der vollkommenen Religion ist. Oder das Christentum ist **die** Religion und alle übrigen Religionen sind nur insofern Religion, als ihr Kern dem Christentum verwandt ist." (I., 195.)

Die **Wahrheit des Christentums** im Sinn seiner überweltlichen Wirklichkeit läßt sich nur durch eine bestimmte Erfahrung erweisen. „Der in Frage stehende Beweis besteht darin, daß in der willentlichen Umwandlung des Willens die absolute Geistigkeit des Urwillens als Kausalität mitgesetzt ist. Diesen Vorgang nennen wir in der Sprache der Kirche, die Wiedergeburt oder Bekehrung und die beiden Seiten, die er hat, entsprechen dem, was man Glaube und Liebe nennt." (I., 213.)

Quelle der christlichen Dogmatik ist für Seeberg nicht die subjektive Erfahrung, auch nicht die Bibellehre, sondern die „geglaubte Offenbarung." In der Erkenntnistheorie, die für die Methode der Dogmatik maßgebend ist, verknüpft Seeberg „die intuitive Erkenntnis des Ueberweltlichen mit der Verstandeserkenntnis von der Welt." (I., 281.) Das heißt eine irrationale mit einer rationalen Erkenntnistheorie. Bei den **einzelnen Dogmen** nimmt Seeberg eine mehr oder minder weitgehende Umformung der überlieferten Formeln vor. Das zeigt besonders deutlich seine Trinitätslehre. Nach ihm ist Sinn der **Trinität**: Erstens „Gott will, das die Naturwelt sei, werde und sein werde"; zweitens „Gott will, das die gegen ihn wollende oder sündige geistige Welt seinem herrschenden Willen unterworfen und dadurch sein werde" (I., 381); drittens „Gott will, daß besondre Personen in einer ihrem besonderen Bedarf entsprechenden Wechselwirkung mit andern Personen, Glieder seiner Kirche werden und sich in ihr betätigen." (I., 382.) Kürzer ausgedrückt, macht das Wesen der Trinität aus: „Der Vater will Welt, der Sohn will Kirche, der Geist will mich." (I., 382.)

Am Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts schien sich an Seeberg eine ganze **modern-positive Richtung** in der Theologie anschließen zu wollen. Dies ist aber nicht geschehen, sofern die in Betracht kommenden Theologen sich entweder stärker der neuprotestantischen Theologie oder der positiven Theologie im älteren Sinn zuwandten. Das Letztere gilt auch von **Girgensohn**, Leipzig (1875—1925), in seinen „Zwölf Reden über die christliche Religion" und in seinem

„Grundriß der Dogmatik.“ (1924.) Seine selbständige Arbeit gehörte der **Religionspsychologie,** die er in dem großen Werk niederlegte, das nach experimenteller Methode gearbeitet war: „Der seelische Aufbau des religiösen Erlebens.“ (1921.)

4. Einen großen Einfluß auf die jüngere Theologenwelt hat **K. Heim,** Tübingen (geb. 1874), ausgeübt. Stärker wohl noch durch seine praktische, kraftvolle, religiös-pietistische Position als durch seine komplizierten, sich in steter Wandlung befindlichen philosophischen Gedankengänge. Heim vertritt durchaus die altreformatorische Position, die in das Zentrum des Christentums die **Sündenvergebung** setzt. Bezeichnet er doch in seinem „Leitfaden der Dogmatik“ als „das allumfassende Thema der Dogmatik, die Darstellung der unendlichen Sündennot als einer in Christus gelösten.“ Infolgedessen kommt auch für Heim die christliche **Wahrheitsgewißheit** entscheidend auf dem Weg praktischen Gewissenserlebens an der geschichtlichen Person Jesu zustande, die alle Widersprüche beseitigt, welche Denken und Gewissen gegen die Möglichkeit einer Offenbarung Gottes an uns sündige Menschen erheben. In der dritten Auflage seiner „Glaubensgewißheit“ (1923) sagt Heim deutlich im Vorwort: „Die Entstehung des Glaubens ist ganz unabhängig von philosophischen Gedankengängen. Der Glaube kann durch erkenntnistheoretisches Nachdenken weder erschwert noch erleichert, weder verhindert, noch ermöglicht werden.“ Dennoch aber stellt Heim sehr eingehende erkenntnistheoretische Erwägungen an. Diese sollen aber nur dem philosophischen Verständnis des tatsächlich vom Christen Erlebten dienen und darum nur für den kleinen Kreis philosophisch interessierter Menschen von Bedeutung sein. Die Eigenart der **erkenntnistheoretischen Erwägungen** Heims besteht darin, daß er den Gegensatz zwischen dem logischen Denkgesetz der Widerspruchslosigkeit und den Grundformen unsrer Erkenntnis von Raum und Zeit, besonders von Subjekt und Objekt herausarbeitet. Er schließt sich bei der Darstellung dieser Antinomien an Kant an, wie an eine Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts auftauchende Philosophie des Empiriokritizismus. Eine wirkliche Erkenntnis des Transzendenten soll sich in den Erfahrungsformen dieser Welt nicht erreichen lassen, während das Denkgesetz auf eine andre widerspruchslose Daseinsform hinweist. Ob eine solche aber existiert, kann der Mensch nur in bestimmten Erlebnissen erfassen. Das ist im Allgemeinen schon der Fall im Schicksalserlebnis, welches aus einer Wirklichkeit stammt, die jenseits der letzten Gegensätze der Anschauungswelt liegt. Ethischen Charakter gewinnt das Schicksalserlebnis im Christentum, das dem Menschen die Welt Gottes erschließt. Das vom Glauben Erlebte erscheint darum Heim auch phisosophisch denkmöglich.

In der letzten Auflage seiner „Glaubensgewißheit,“ be-

zeichnet Heim es als seine Absicht im Vorwort: „Das neue Verständnis der urchristlichen und reformatorischen Gottesgewißheit, das K. Barths Römerbrief in prophetischer Form zum Ausdruck gebracht hat, in Beziehung zu setzen zu der philosophischen Bewegung, in der wir seit Kants kopernikanischer Tat stehen."

5. Heim verweist auf die **Barthsche** Theologie als die neueste Bewegung, die er als eine prophetische mit Recht bezeichnet oder die einfacher ausgedrückt, als eine praktisch-religiöse zu charakterisieren sein wird. Sie ringt erst um ihre theologischen Ausdrucksformen und hat darum die lebhaftesten Debatten ausgelöst. Ihr Urheber ist Karl Barth, der als Schweizer Pfarrer im Jahre 1918 ein Werk über den **„Römerbrief"** herausgab, das 1921 stark verändert und seitdem noch in mehreren Auflagen erschienen ist. Auf Grund dessen wurde Barth zum Professor der reformierten Theologie zunächst in Göttingen, dann in Münster berufen. Er motiviert sein Werk selbst aus dem Bedürfnis des Predigers, der in den tiefsten Sinn der religiösen Urkunden eindringen, sie auf die Gegenwart anwenden will und sich nicht mit einer grammatisch-historischen Erklärung begnügen kann. Er stellt aber Paulus unter eine ganz besondre Beleuchtung, von der er selbst sagt: „Wenn ich ein System habe, so besteht es darin, daß ich das, was Kiergegaard den unendlichen qualitativen Unterschied von Zeit und Ewigkeit genannt hat, in seiner negativen und positiven Bedeutung möglichst beharrlich im Auge behalte. Gott ist im Himmel und der Mensch auf Erden. Die Beziehung dieses Gottes zu diesem Menschen, die Beziehung dieses Menschen zu diesem Gott ist für mich das Thema der Bibel und die Summe der Philosophie in einem. Die Philosophen nennen diese Krisis des menschlichen Erkennens den Ursprung. Die Bibel stellt an diesen Kreuzweg Jesus Christus. Paulus hat von nichts anderm geredet, als von der permanenten Krisis von Zeit und Ewigkeit." (Vorrede zur zweiten Auflage.) Für Barth besteht zwischen Zeit und Ewigkeit, Gott und unsrer gegenwärtigen Welt ein schroffer durch nichts überdrückter Gegensatz. Grundlegend ist für ihn das altreformierte Axiom: „finitum non est capax infiniti; philosophisch folgt er dem Dualismus Platos — auf den er sich in der zweiten Auflage ausdrücklich beruft —, zwischen der Welt der Ideen und der Welt der Erscheinung. Gott ist ihm wesentlich der „deus absconditus" im Sinn des mittelalterlichen Scholastikers Occam — ein Gedanke, der zwar von Luther auch übernommen, aber durch den „deus revelatus" überwunden wurde. Der Mensch ist nach dem Fall für Barth nur Sünde, die Welt liegt allein im Argen; eine wirkliche Heilsgeschichte gibt es nicht. In voller Paradoxie offenbart sich Gott in Christus, welcher den Sünder für gerecht erklärt, obwohl er es nicht ist und auch hier nicht zu werden anfängt.

Diese Offenbarung gilt im gehorsamen Glauben für richtig zu halten, ohne daß der Mensch entsprechende seelisch subjektive Veränderungen bei sich beobachtet. Denn wie die Geschichte, so lehnt Barth auch die Psychologie ab und bekämpft mit seinen Schülern —wie Brunner, Gogarten, Thurneyssen (Zeitschrift „Zwischen den Zeiten," München) — besonders scharf Schleiermacher. Barth kennt nur „justificatio" und keine „renovatio." Darum erscheint ihm auch die Ethik nicht nur in sozialer, sondern auch in individueller Form als eine sehr fragwürdige Größe. Die Umgestaltung des Einzelnen und erst recht der Welt erfolgt erst im eschatologischen Jenseits. Die ganze Religiosität ist mehr auf Zukunftshoffnung als auf gegenwärtiges Glauben und daraus erwachsende Liebe eingestellt.

Barth nennt als die Männer, an welche er anknüpft: „Die Ahnenreihe, an der wir uns hier zu orientieren haben, läuft über Kierkegaard zu Luther, und Kalvin zu Paulus, zu Jeremia." („Das Wort Gottes und die Theologie," Seite 59.) Barth hätte aus der Gegenwart auch noch Schäders theozentrische, Heims dialektische Theologie und die Bestimmung des Heiligen bei Otto nennen können. Fraglos ist er aber entscheidend durch reformatorische und urchristliche Gedankengänge bestimmt. So knüpft er bei Luther an „de servo arbitrio" an und an den gesamten Aufriß der Theologie und Religion bei Kalvin. Er stellt aber andre Elemente in Luthers Christentum, wie den Glauben an den Schöpfergott, die heilsgeschichtliche Orientierung, die gegenwärtige Heilsgewißheit von der Liebe Gottes wie die ethischen Gedankengänge zurück. Insofern handelt es sich bei Barth nur um eine sehr einseitige, gebrochene Wiederbelebung des Altprotestantismus und auch des Urchristentums. Die theologisch-wissenschaftliche Ausarbeitung von Barths religiöser Haltung befindet sich bei ihm selbst und seinen Freunden noch in dem Maße im Fluß — er beginnt jetzt in „Dogmatik im Entwurf" („Lehre vom Worte Gottes," München, 1922) —, daß sie in einer geschichtlichen Darstellung der Theologie, die mit dem Jahre 1925 ihren Abschluß erreicht, noch nicht reproduziert werden kann.

(Ueber die jeweilig neusten Erscheinungen in der deutschen Theologie unterrichtet die in ihrem systematischen Teil von Prof. R. Vollrath, Erlangen, bearbeitete „Theologie der Gegenwart.")

EDITORIALS

"I BELIEVE IN ONE, HOLY, UNIVERSAL, CHRISTIAN CHURCH"

We observed Reformation day only last Sunday. Luther emancipated us from the organized church and made Christ central, instead of the church. The institutional church cast him out; he comforted himself with the fact that he belonged to the invisible church. The Pope might excommunicate him but he could not cast him off from membership in Christ's body. Faith in Christ was the saving act; without that all the religious functions such as prayer, confession, sacraments, giving of alms, etc., were only opera operata. The word of God was the rule as well as the source of the Christian life and faith, but not the letter of the word but the word spiritually discerned and as far as it preached Christ or prepared for him.

Taking it all in all, we can say that the Reformer stressed the *subjective* side of the religious life at the expense of the objective. Under the circumstances this could hardly be avoided. The pendulum had gone so far towards the institutional and tangible that when it swung back it was bound to go to the other extreme. It was found necessary to guard the *doctrinal* element of the church against subjective licence. The creeds and confessions that were worked out in the reformation age represented scriptural teaching as interpreted by the church. The church itself, however, as an organization in the practical world was entirely neglected. Luther had no gifts and little interest in this direction. If only the gospel was preached, he believed, everything would be well in the end. He had no bishops to put at the head of the church; so he made the princes the "emergency" heads ("Notbischoefe") of it But what was thought of as an emergency only, remained a permanent institution and soon there were as many state churches ("Landeskirchen") as there were princes in the "territorial system," then in force in Germany. By and by the church came into complete dependence of the state, the ministers were looked upon as officials of the state, with all the disastrous consequences that has had in the Lutheran churches of the continent.

The Calvinistic churches did not make the mistake of underestimating organization and constitution. Their emphasis was on the visible congregation as the fruit of Christian teaching. They invested the lay element with authority and responsibility; they allowed no state interference in religious matters. As a result they fared better, on the whole, than the Lutheran churches. Religious

indifference and hostility has never been so pronounced and general as in purely Lutheran lands (cp. Saxony, Braunschweig, Thuringia and their experiences since the war).

The Reformed had no understanding, though, of the symbolism of religious art or of the importance of stated forms of worship. Their churches were mere meeting houses, and their services had no attractiveness beyond what the minister might provide. Besides, their subjectivism carried them to inordinate lengths. Where favorable ground was given, as in England and, particularly, in America, new sects could spring up over night, each one claiming to come closest to the spiritual ideal. No consideration was given to historic growth. Instead of trying to conserve what was good and reform what needed improvement, they constructed new organizations according to the dictates of their conscience and their lopsided knowledge of scripture.

Given these and other causes, it is no wonder that the Protestant principle seems today to have run to seed. The Protestant church has not nearly the prestige you would expect when you consider that it is the church of the leading nations of the world. We are interested mostly in the church in our own land. Catholicism has never been so conscious of power here as it is today. Yesterday Schrembs, the bishop of the Cleveland diocese, reviewed the seven years of his episcopal work here. He said 47 parishes were organized during that time. And these parishes are large, very large; their church buildings are improving in magnitude and beauty. What is best, from the Catholic standpoint, they are crowded. Some, we were told by neighbors, have to hold three and four services on Sunday morning to accommodate the multitude! In summer, when many Protestant churches are closed for vacation! Protestants sometimes say, they *have* to go, their priests compel them. It seems to us they go gladly. Cardinal Gibbons used to remark the Protestants claim the Catholic laity are in chains; well, if they are, Catholics consider them golden chains.

It is time for us to learn from the Catholics. Not only that denominational barriers must be laid down and the unity of the church emphasized. Also that we need the church as an objective and substantial factor in the building of Christ's Kingdom and our own religious welfare. Liberals in Germany say the more they advance in Christian insight the less they need the church. A more pernicious sentiment has seldom been expressed. If they had said, at least, the more the *church* needs *us*. But no, as far as they are concerned, the church might as well go under.

For us who love the church and *depend on it* there is hardly anything more important than to find ways and means to make our people see the error of their ways, to make them think more highly

of the church as an institution. Our people are not in any danger of thinking that church-going is all there is to the Christian life. They quite generally underestimate it. If we can inspire them with a little of the respect and reverence the Catholic has for his own church things will begin to brighten up considerably; but it will be hard work and take intelligent, earnest and long-continued effort.

"HE READS HIS SERMONS"

When the writer, years ago, entered McCormick Seminary, Chicago, as a student, he found many things different there than at the theological institutions he had attended. The greatest novelty, however, was to him the presence, on the staff, of a teacher of elocution. He had never heard a lecture on elocution in his life. And now it began to dawn upon him how great an effect an understanding of the rules of elocution might have on the delivery of the sermons, or even on the reading of scripture, in the church. At the present time there may hardly be a seminary in the country that does not make provision for training in elocution, and it is to be hoped that the students of today appreciate such training more than did those at McCormick in my time. I then seemed to be about the only one who treated that professor with respect; in part, because in my opinion every professor ought to be so treated, and partly because this particular subject, so new to me, impressed me as exceedingly valuable.

One thing the professor did not discuss was the question whether the sermon should be read from manuscript or freely delivered. He probably considered this a matter to be decided by the professor of homiletics. And he was right. That chair was then held by Dr. Herrick Johnson, who was also the president of the seminary, a man of unusual teaching ability and of a forceful, imposing personality. Dr. Johnson went into the question with great care. He said that great preachers of the Presbyterian church, in the past, had used the manuscript method with telling effect, and that it had never thinned out their audiences. Furthermore, that it might be so used today, before "lettered" audiences, that is, before people who would appreciate the greater precision of thought and the nobler form of diction that the manuscript made possible. Nevertheless, he admitted that the free delivery was on the whole more preferable, that manuscript preaching was going out of date and that doubtless the manuscript was something of a handicap to the spontaneous intercourse between speaker and congregation.

I, personally, was fully convinced that no manuscript should be brought into the pulpit. I had never heard a sermon read in

all my life, I knew only one pastor in all of Germany who read his sermons. He did it effectively, he preached to large audiences, but they felt they had to apologize for that one defect: "he had no memory."

Since then my experience has become considerably enlarged. I have heard many manuscript preachers. We had one here, in an old Presbyterian church, a down-town place, who held his own for more than 20 years, reading all his sermons, morning and evening, word for word. He has had two successors by now, neither of them using the manuscript, but neither wielding even a mite of his power.

As Dr. Johnson said, in certain churches a manuscript preacher may be appreciated. In a German church, or a church of German antecedents, he would not. Why is it, so we feel impelled to inquire, that the reading preacher is found only in American churches and not in German ones. And why in American churches of a certain kind only? Seldom in a Methodist or Baptist church, and oftener in Congregational, Presbyterian and Episcopal communions. It can be seen readily that he is a phenomenon peculiar to the churches of wealth, education and prominence. In America such people, although of the upper strata of social life, still go to church, but to a church of their social level. In Germany the rich and educated go to church only rarely; and if they do they can't go to a church composed of members of their own class only. They go to a church that everyone goes to, consequently, the German pastor has a congregation of all kinds but mostly of ordinary people, and in his sermon he *tries to reach* the *common man*. Naturally, then, he preaches a simple sermon; he does not read an essay. As Luther advised him many years ago, saying, "when you preach preach to 'Hans' and 'Kunz,' not to some doctor or professor that may happen to be there."

The American pastor of a prominent and cultured church discusses all kinds of topics. He must be well posted on the questions of the moment, and in order to satisfy the fastidious taste of his audience, great demands are made on the form and substance of his address. These he can *best fulfil* by a *carefully written-out essay*. If he is not to spoil the essay in delivering it he is compelled to read it.

From all this it can be perceived that the custom that lately is developing amongst us, of reading from the manuscript, is not a wise one. It cannot count on the favor of the public, and it is apt to offer to our people a style of speaking they don't easily comprehend. It is well enough to write out the sermon; we prefer that by a large margin to the making of notes. After the sermon, however, has been written it ought to be freely reproduced.

Was sichert bei uns den Pastor seine Stellung?

Der Pastor in einer der deutschen Landeskirchen hat eine beneidenswerte feste Position in seinem Amt. Er ist angestellt auf Lebenszeit. Weder die Gemeinde noch seine vorgesetzte Behörde können ihn antasten, so lange er anständig lebt und seine Pflicht tut. Ganz anders mit dem Pastor in unsrer Kirche. Er ist gewählt auf unbestimmte Zeit, und wenn erst die erste Liebe erkaltet ist, so können viele und oft ganz unwürdige Gründe ihm den Paragraphen von der „dreimonatlichen Kündigungsfrist" ins Gedächtnis rufen. Selbst in unserm Land gibt es andre Kirchen, wo der Pastor vor solch unangenehmen Ueberraschungen mehr geschützt ist. Die Methodisten geben ihren Pastoren ihre „Bestallung" von Jahr zu Jahr. Ist ein Wechsel am Ende des Konferenzjahres rätlich, so wird dem Betreffenden alsbald ein anders Feld zugewiesen. Bei den Episkopalen wählt die „vestry" den Pastor, und man hört äußerst selten, daß diese Behörde ihren Rektor vor die Tür setzt. Selbst die Lutheraner, obwohl bei ihnen das Gemeindeprinzip stark betont wird, bringen dem Amt hohe Achtung entgegen und lassen sich selbst in delikaten Fällen von den Synodal- oder Distriktsbeamten willig beraten.

Bei uns ist das wesentlich anders; hier ist der Pastor ohne jede offizielle Rückendeckung. Der Distriktspräses kann ihm wenig helfen, wenn seine Popularität anfängt zu verblassen, oder wenn seine Erfolge den Erwartungen nicht entsprechen. Gibt es denn nun einen Weg, vermöge dessen der Pastor sich der Gemeinde so wertvoll machen kann, daß sie auch in schweren oder unruhigen Zeiten ihm treu bleibt?

Die Krone seines Amtes ist doch die Predigt, in unserm Land wird er meistens mit dem Titel „preacher" belegt, was andeutet, daß auch im Bewußtsein des Volkes die Predigt seine wichtigste Domäne ist.* Kann er denn nun seiner Stellung sicher sein, wenn er sich bemüht, auf der Kanzel etwas Tüchtiges zu leisten?

Es soll gewiß nicht geleugnet werden, daß manche Gemeinden stolz sind, wenn ihr Pastor als Prediger sich einen Ruf erworben hat, und daß ihm das eine Gewähr auf viele Jahre ungehinderter Arbeit gibt. Es finden sich in den englisch-amerikanischen Kreisen Gemeinden, wo der Pastor seine Stellung wesentlich der Predigt verdankt und die andre Arbeit andern Kräften überlassen ist. Es wäre leicht, eine Reihe von Beispielen anzuführen, wo eine solche Situation vorliegt, meist in den großen Städten.

Bei uns aber gibt es solche Fälle kaum, zum mindesten sind sie sehr selten. Eine solche Wertschätzung der Predigt setzt gewöhn-

*) Siehe den interessanten Artikel von Arthur Phelps über „The Importance of the Ability to Speak in Public" in der Oktobernummer des „Expositor."

lich bei der Gemeinde einen Bildungszustand voraus, der bei uns nur ausnahmsweise anzutreffen ist. Selbstverständlich hören auch unsre Leute lieber einen anziehenden Redner als einen langweiligen. Die wenigstens aber wissen eine Predigt recht zu beurteilen. Wenn einer „laut und deutlich" spricht, wenn er „forsch" ins Zeug geht, wenn der Schwall der Rede begeistert dahin fließt, so glauben sie, sie hätten etwas Gutes gehört. Aber selbst auch wenn sie ihren Pastor für einen fähigen Prediger halten, so sind sie darum noch lange nicht zufrieden. Oftmals steht ein Prediger auf der Kanzel, den seine Amtsgenossen sterblich langweilig finden, den aber seine Gemeinde für eine köstliche Perle hält, und der auch seine Leute besser zusammenhält als ein beredter Apollos (Apg. 18, 24) oder ein hinreißender Talmage.

Unsre Leute lassen sich mehr von der **Persönlichkeit** des Pastors beeinflussen als von seiner Predigt. Damit meinen wir nicht so sehr eine starke, selbstbewußte, kraftvolle Persönlichkeit; was die Gemeinden besonders zu schätzen scheinen ist Leutseligkeit, Umgänglichkeit, Anpassungsfähigkeit (etwa das paulinische: allen alles zu sein; ins Alltägliche und Amerikanische übersetzt: „he must be a ‚mixer'").

Wenn der Pastor diese Eigenschaften hat und dazu die „modernen Methoden" anzuwenden weiß, das heißt wenn er ein praktischer Mann ist in der Propaganda, in der Pflege des geselligen Lebens, findig in immer neuen Weisen, die Gemeinde im Atem zu halten, dann ist er ein erfolgreicher Arbeiter. Dann hat er Zuhörer, dann mehrt sich die Gliederzahl, dann ist immer Geld genug im Gemeindesäckel, um den finanziellen Verpflichtungen nachzukommen. Auf der Kanzel mag er wenig leisten, aber unter der Kanzel um so mehr.

Es liegt auf der Hand, daß unter diesen Umständen auch bei den Pastoren die Predigt in zweite oder dritte Stelle rückt. Es ist ein biologisches Gesetz, daß nur der Organismus Lebensfähigkeit behält, der sich an seine Umgebung je nach ihren Anforderungen anpaßt. Unsre kirchliche Umgebung („environment") verlangt nicht besondre Predigttüchtigkeit, sie verlangt gute Ausstattung in den eben genannten Dingen. Daher kommt es, daß im großen und ganzen bei uns die Predigt auf einer niedrigen Stufe steht.

Nichts desto weniger gibt es solche, die an ihrem Teil die Pflege des Kanzeldienstes für ihr höchstes Ziel halten. Es ist gut, daß es so ist. Jedoch folgt aus dem Gesagten — so anders unsre Auffassung korrekt ist — daß sie gut tun werden, die Beschaffenheit ihres kirchlichen „Milieu" nicht außer Acht zu lassen. Denn täten sie es nicht, so möchten sie in die Lage kommen, sich bald für ihre Tätigkeit eine andre Kanzel aussuchen zu müssen. Für den älteren Pastor wird das ein immer heikleres Problem.

Die Präsidentenwahl.

Wenn diese Dummer des „Magazins" in die Hände der Leser gelangt, stehen wir am Vorabend der Präsidentenwahl. Es ist nicht unsre Absicht, unsre Leser politisch zu beeinflussen; wir schreiben das Nachfolgende mehr um uns selbst Rechenschaft zu geben, warum wir für den einen Kandidaten sind und nicht für den andern.

Wir setzen gar nicht voraus, daß es nötig ist, unsre Freunde zu warnen, dem Gouverneur von New York ihre Stimme zu geben. Es mag unter uns sich eine Reihe von solchen befinden, die für Thomas stimmen werden, weil sie von den beiden großen Parteien nicht eine radikale Aenderung bestehender Verhältnisse erwarten, insonderheit nicht die Abschaffung des kapitalistischen Systems. Wer aus diesem Grund Herrn Thomas seine Stimme gibt, erwartet keine praktischen Resultate, sondern spricht nur seine Ueberzeugung aus, daß Thomas und seine Plattform dem Ideal am nächsten kommen.

Für uns andre, die wir uns ans praktisch Ausführbare mehr als an das Wünschenswerte halten, scheint die Wahl diesmal nicht schwer zu sein. Zwar sind wir kürzlich durch die Entdeckung überrascht worden, daß es auch unter protestantischen Theologen solche gibt, die sich für Smith eher als für Hoover entscheiden würden, wenn es sich nur um diese beiden handelte. Hoover ist ihnen der verkörperte Vertreter von „Big Business" und ein eingefleischter Bewunderer des herrschenden Systems. Bei Smith und seiner Partei finden sie mehr Kritik, mehr freiheitliche Ideen, mehr Möglichkeit des Fortschritts. Wir können diese Ansichten nicht teilen. Gewiß kritisiert die Plattform der Demokraten mehr; die Demokraten sind in der Opposition, und die Opposition lebt stets von der Kritik. Aber wie würde es um die **Taten** stehen, wenn die Partei in die Macht käme? Geo. W. Olvany, der gegenwärtige „Tammany leader," gab bei seiner Rückkehr von Houston die folgende Erklärung ab: „Die großen Geschäftsleute und industriellen Führer wissen, daß Gouverneur Smith sie nicht stören wird. There will be no meddling with business."

Präsident Wilson sprach seinerzeit schöne Worte von einer „New Freedom" und von der Befreiung des Volkes von dem „Invisible Government"; aber sind diese schönen Versprechungen irgendwelche Taten gefolgt?

Viel Rühmliches ist in den letzten Monaten von Al. Smith gesagt worden und von seiner Unabhängigkeit von „Tammany Hall." Es mag daran manches Wahre sein. Wer jedoch die Geschichte dieser politischen Organisation kennt, wird von einem Produkt und Glied derselben nicht allzuviel erwarten. Selbst wenn die Persönlichkeit und die Leistungen des Kandidaten uns ansprä-

chen, so würden wir doch das Gefühl nicht unterdrücken können: „Es tut mir in der Seele weh, wenn ich dich in der Gesellschaft seh!"

Al. Smith ist ein treuer Sohn seiner Kirche. Er ist Katholik. Ohne Zweifel werden die Katholiken des Landes beinahe einstimmig für ihn eintreten. Man macht es katholischerseits den Protestanten zum Vorwurf, daß ihnen diese Tatsache unangenehm ist: das sei puritanische Intoleranz und Bigotterie. Ein solcher Vorwurf hört sich seltsam an im Mund katholischer Führer. Viele protestantische Amerikaner aber fühlen sich dadurch empfindlich getroffen, sie wollen um alles nicht intolerant genannt werden. Zu starkes Betonen des religiösen Faktors mag Smith in der Oeffentlichkeit mehr nützen als schaden. Dennoch wird der Protestant die Sorge nicht los, daß ein katholischer Präsident Religionsgenossen in hohe Stellung bringen dürfte, die dort sich von ihren religiösen Gefühlen mehr leiten ließen als von patriotischen.

Bleibt noch die Frage der Prohibition, nach beinahe allgemeiner Ansicht die wichtigste von allen. Beide Parteien sprechen sich freilich für die strikte Durchführung des 18. Amendments aus, aber Smith hat sich persönlich die Bahn freigemacht für eine Aenderung des Prohibitionsgesetzes. Er ist selbst naß, obwohl die Plattform trocken ist. Damit hat er seine Partei in eine schiefe Stellung gebracht. Der Süden, wo die Partei ihre Stärke hat, ist trocken und sieht sich nun vor das Dilemma gestellt, entweder seine Prinzipien oder seine Tradition aufzuheben. Im Norden dagegen und in den großen Städten jubeln Millionen Smith zu als dem Moses, der sie aus der Wüste führen soll (eigentlich sollte es ja Josua heißen). Auch das deutsche Votum ist dadurch stark beeinflußt. In Wisconsin, so heißt es, ist die Mehrheit der Deutschen für Smith; so auch an vielen andern Orten. Die Vereinsdeutschen zumal können schwer ohne ihr Bier fertig werden, und indem sie darauf hoffen, finden sie eine sittliche Begründung in dem Bewußtsein, daß die Prohibition die Mutter der Heuchelei und die Quelle der Gesetzesverachtung sei.

Wir wollen uns hier nicht über Prohibition oder Antiprohibition aussprechen. Argumente für und gegen werden allerwärts mit Hitze ins Feld geführt. Sie überzeugen nur den, der schon vorher dafür oder dagegen eingenommen ist. Gerade wie die Argumente für Deutschlands Alleinschuld im letzten Krieg. Persönlich neigen wir etwas mehr nach der Prohibitionsseite hin. Aber ob Smith oder Hoover gewählt wird, die Prohibition bleibt.

Nun, Brüder, wählt den besten Mann. Und wenn ihr ihn weder bei den Republikanern noch bei den Demokraten finden könnt, dann stimmt für Thomas. Vielleicht ist es gut, wenn die großen Parteien lernen, daß sie nicht ewig oben bleiben.

The Christian World

Survey of Churches Shows Metropolitan Chicago Ninety Per Cent Religious

THE LIVING CHURCH NEWS BUREAU—Chicago, Aug. 24, 1928

Some of the results of a recent religious survey of this city, made by the Chicago Church Federation, are of such general interest and value as to deserve attention and study by Christian people of whatever faith. According to the report of the survey sent out by Walter R. Mee, executive secretary of the Federation, metropolitan Chicago is ninety per cent religious, a percentage not surpassed by any city of half a million or more in the United States. It may seem hard to reconcile this statement with the criminal records and conditions which exist here, and which have given the city an evil name everywhere. But Chicago has always been a place of paradoxes.

"The Roman Catholic and combined Protestant groups" (and Mr. Mee lists the Episcopalians among the latter) "about equal each other in numbers, with the individual Catholic churches exceeding in size and membership, while the Protestant churches are the largest group numerically. Jews are also strong religiously. Approximately one thousand churches are to be found in the Chicago area.

"With a population of approximately 3,500,000 in its metropolitan area, Chicago churches have over 3,000,000 members and adherents. About 2,500,000 of these are divided equally between the Roman Catholic Church and the various Protestant denominations and miscellaneous sects. There are about 400,000 Jews in this area.

"The Roman Catholic Church is the largest single unit, with about 380 churches, many of them with constituencies running up into thousands. The unity of the Roman Church has enabled it to distribute its churches for effective service.

"Protestant bodies possess about 1,300 church buildings, although there are scores of additional congregations—some of them notable, such as Central Church—worshipping in other buildings, such as halls, theaters, and missions. In addition there are such buildings as those occupied by the Christian Scientists, eighteen in all, and the quarters and missions of the Salvation Army, Volunteers of America, and miscellaneous groups.

"The Baptists, including the colored Baptist churches, lead with 339 churches. The Lutherans are second with 221 churches; the Methodists have 220; the Presbyterians 116; the Congregationalists 108; the Episcopalians 81; and the Evangelical Synod of North America 85. The total number of priests, ministers, and rabbis, including those engaged in educational and social service work, as well as in parish activity, is probably close to 5,000.

"The total number of Protestant adherents is obtained by multiplying the membership on the roll by 2.8, which was the standard accepted by the government during the war in establishing the ratios for denominational representation among the army and navy chaplains. This membership basis is 429,265.

"In addition to the church buildings, hundreds of other buildings are maintained by the Chicago churches for services. Protestant churches maintain a magnificent system of hospitals, orphanages, old people's homes, colleges, and universities.

"Property values of all these are doubtless in excess of a quarter of a billion dollars. It is probable that at least sixty or seventy per cent of the people are reached each week with some sort of religious ministry or other. I know of no other city in America where the influence is more thorough-going.

"Religious unity is increasing, and federated activities that would not have been dreamed of twenty years ago are now a fact. Among the majority of Protestant denominations there is complete accord, with the elimination of competitive efforts in old neighborhoods as fast as possible, and with the establishment of community churches under denominational auspices in new suburbs to take care of the whole population."

What Universalists Believe

Recently the King's Daughters of the Universalist Church in Syracuse, N. Y., asked Rev. Frederick W. Betts, D.D., to address them upon "What Universalists Believe." We are indebted to the *Syracuse Post Standard* for the following abstract of the notable address Dr. Betts made.

"One can not measure the ocean in a pint cup, nor describe a great spiritual faith in thirty minutes. There is another difficulty. No series of doctrines can express a great faith. A great faith is a great conviction about the meaning of life. It must be bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh, red with our blood.

"It is something one lives by, and dies for if necessary. It is a driving energy which encloses one's will for its accomplishment. There are three possible interpretations of the world and of human life and destiny.

"There is the traditional interpretation which assumes that the whole meaning and direction of the world and of human experience is all twisted and wrong. It declares that human nature is fallen and corrupt, and that only a miracle, only a super-natural interference with and reversal of the natural order of things, can save the world and man from everlasting disaster.

"Only those who, by accepting this supernatural interference are regenerated can hope for happiness hereafter. As for the great mass of mankind outside of this supernatural redemption, the less said the better.

"There is the materialistic or pseudo-scientific interpretation of the world. In the beginning there was a mysterious substance composed of atoms and energy. In this substance were certain self constituted resident qualities. Somehow, these atoms and energy and resident forces, through a fortunate or unfortunate adaptation and cooperation, produced the world and all that is in it.

"Consciousness, mind and thought are the climax of this mosmic process. But all is transient and temporary. In the end all will dissolve like the baseless fabric of a dream and return again to that original, unconscious substance, there to begin again, to repeat the process forever.

"The third interpretation we may describe as prophetic idealism. In the beginning was God. In Him was spiritual intelligence. He is the ultimate reality, the Spirit in all things. Creation is the expression and symbol of His thoughts. The world and human experience are the unfolding of those thoughts. The whole cosmic process is therefore at heart, spiritual.

"The world is on the way. Growth, expansion, and evolution are the story of the unfolding and direction of spiritual purpose. There is the prophetic soul of the wide world dreaming of things to come. Man is a climber; he is an incurable idealist. He dreams, but is never content. In him is the law and energy of the prophetic idealism which is the divine purpose in creation.

"An old saint said that man can not be content, for he was made for God. God is the ideal. The ideal is the Infinite in whose image man is made. Lowell said of Lincoln that nature made the man, then broke the mold. Nature with God made Jesus, then broke the mold. He is the Man that is to be when God has made the pile complete.

"Our Universalist faith rests on this whole cosmic process. This faith does not depend upon miracles. For it, the super-natural, is the other side of the natural. This cosmic process, this prophetic idealism, this purpose of God which is the law of our growth, creates a blessed confidence in the future and forever.

"Stanley Baldwin said, a few weeks ago, that while we work sometimes in fog or twilight, if we did not believe that sometime, even though it be a million years away, we could bring about the kingdom of God on earth, it would not be worth while to be even the prime minister of the British empire.

"Universalists do not claim any monopoly of truth, but they do say with a coviction that is unconquerable that it is the faith which the prime minister of the British empire formulates which gives meaning and purpose to human existence. It is all a blessed and holy confidence in that loving kindness and tender mercy of Almighty God which never fails.

Can Anglicans Preach?

By the Rev. A. Ritchie Low

Minister, the United Church of Colchester, Vermont

I have been greatly interested in Church worship. During the past five years scores of books on this subject have passed through my hands. Seldom do I attend a Non-conformist service that I do not say to myself, "If only instead of those ugly organ pipes they had erected an altar with the Cross in the center. . . . ."

My friends in the Anglican Church ought to preach well for, as a Baptist or Congregationalist would say, they have all the "trimmings" or "trappings" at their disposal and do not, like their less fortunate brethren, have to create the atmosphere of worship, it being there in the first place. I maintain that they therefore ought to preach if not better at least equally as well as the Presbyterian or Methodist minister. But my candid opinion is that as a rule the average Non-conformist is a better pulpiteer than is his fellow worker in the Anglican fold.

A year or two ago I said to myself: "These Episcopalians have the right idea regarding worship, for their churches create the desire to bend the knee in silent adoration, their churches have that esthetic touch which ours so sadly lack, and yet why do they grow more rapidly than they do? Here are the Baptists with little or nothing in the way of inspirational worship, yet see how they multiply!" Today I think I have the answer to the reason why this so often happens. Plainly speaking, it is this: Comparatively few Episcopalian rectors are preachers.

I am not now saying that they are any less intelligent and less resourceful than the Presbyterians, Methodists, or Congregationalists. It is simply that they do not take the business of preaching seriously enough. I have on my study wall the pictures of twenty-five peers of the American pulpit, representing many communions, and not one of whom is listed as an Anglican.

I favor very much a change in the architecture of the average Protestant church. I have ceased voting for a "meeting house" and now cast my ballot for a house of worship. And yet I am frank to confess that I do not desire to make the change at the expense of preaching. We must not forget that the pulpit preceded the altar. Faith cometh by hearing. It is through the foolishness of preaching that men come to believe. Three thousand were brought to the Lord Jesus Christ at Pentecost by the Holy Spirit operating through the oratory of one Simon Peter. What the Episcopal Church in the United States needs, it seems to me, is a revival of the emphasis on the preaching of the Word.

Some one may rise to tell me that people go to church to worship and not primarily to listen to a sermon. I agree. Would to God that more of the brethren in my own communion, the Baptist, might come to realize this important truth. On the other hand some of my Angli-

can friends who are wont to make light of their Non-conformist brothers putting so much stress on the spoken word do so because they themselves are not willing to pay the price, in terms of labor and study, that good preaching involves. We are all of us likely to consider unimportant the thing that does not greatly appeal to us. Sermons are only important in proportion to the amount of labor they involve.

I do not desire to give my readers the impression that almost every Baptist, Presbyterian, and Methodist minister is a Henry Ward Beecher and that the majority of Anglicans are insignificant in comparison. No. Each Church has its Harry Emerson Fosdicks, although most of us are frank enough to admit that the supply is not very plentiful. No man knows better than does the man in the pew that so far as preaching is concerned most of us are pretty small potatoes. Now each Church has its quota of small potatoes, although I am frank to say that the Episcopal Church seems to have more than its share.

If we Non-conformists have blundered in the art of worship, in the manner in which we have built our churches, it seems to me the Anglicans have, in many instances, failed to give the ministry of the Word its rightful place. Again, I may be told that the Episcopal Church *has* produced some great and outstanding leaders. Since I have read the biographies of most of the "big guns" of the daughter Church, I am not unacquainted with this fact. I could, were there space enough, give a long list of such, but I desist because I take it for granted that my readers are likewise familiar with them.

And I have been interested, in going over some of their careers, to note that nearly every one of them was outstanding because he did not get up in the pulpit because he had to say something, but rather because he had something to say and knew how to say it. It is, of course, quite true that many Anglican leaders have not been known as pulpiteers, but they made their mark in spite of this lack and not because of it. But the great need is for men who know how to give forth the whole counsel of God.

Silvester Horne once said that the gospel is not the survival of the fit but the revival of the unfit. True. And one of the ways in which the unfit may be revived and made new creatures in Christ Jesus is through the vigorous utterance of the Good News.

Anglican and Non-conformist alike would do well to rediscover the dynamic changes that can be brought forth in the lives of men when the foolishness of preaching is taken seriously. In the meanwhile I again raise the question, Can Anglicans preach? While I have had my say I close this article as a candidate for illumination.

The Living Church.

Bill Stidger In Boston

Something will be doing on our corner in old Boston this fall. Strictly speaking, we are just off the corner, as befits a less plutocratic crowd, but nevertheless we feel a sense of pride and ownership in the intersection just above. On one of the expensive corner sites stands the Normal Art School, on another a public school, on the third the old Spiritualist Temple, now turned into a moving picture house, and on the fourth the old Edward Everett Hale Church, taken over by the Methodists a year or so ago.

It is in this latter structure that things will begin to move, for Bill Stidger is coming to town, and where Bill Stidger comes the crowds come, and standing-room-only signs speedily are hung out. The Rev. William L. Stidger, six years on the Pacific Coast, six years in Detroit, and four years in Kansas City, has been appointed pastor of the Copley Church in Boston, and will begin work in September. Honest, outspoken, unusual in his methods, always earnest and eloquent, Bill Stidger, as he is affectionately called, has carried everything before him in the West. Can he do as well in Boston? Will the self-constrained, cold, reserved New Englanders flock to hear him? Will he pack a Boston church where even the very janitor gives an icy stare to one who speaks to him without a proper introduction? But Bill Stidger in Boston will be Dr. Stidger, likewise Professor Stidger, for he will hold the chair of Homiletics at Boston University. Perhaps he will be tamed. We hope not. A little Mid-West unction would not be wasted in any denomination of Boston Christians. A little shirt-sleeve hustle would make an impression anywhere in what used to be the Hub.

We must not give a wrong impression. Dr. Stidger is an ex-truck driver in the war zone of France, but he also is a poet of insight and the author of some twenty serious books. His coming to Boston is part of a novel experiment. President Marsh of Boston University has announced that Boston University School of Theology has taken four of the greatest preachers of Metropolitan Boston and made them associates of Dr. Stidger in the Department of Preaching and Pastoral Science. These four men are Dr. Henry Hitt Crane, pastor of the Center Methodist Episcopal Church, Malden, Dr. Henry K. Sherrill, rector of Trinity Episcopal Church, Boston, who was recently elected Bishop Coadjutor of Pennsylvania, but declined, Dr. Raymond Calkins, pastor of the First Congregational Church, Cambridge, and Dr. Samuel Macaulay Lindsay, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Brookline. The course to be given by these men will be carried through the entire year, each man giving two hours a week through one quarter of the year.

We wish Dr. Stidger the greatest success, both as a preacher and a teacher. We are glad to have such a virile, charming personality as a neighbor.—*Christian Leader.*

Book Review

(When ordering books, please mention this Magazine.)
NOTE—Reviews, when not signed, are by the Editor.

Charles Proteus Steinmetz. A biography by *John W. Hammond.* The Century Co., New York, 489 pages.

The other day we happened on this biography of the famous electrical engineer. We found it so interesting that we decided to make a brief mention of it here, notwithstanding the fact that Steinmetz died five year ago and this book came out a year later. The life of the man itself is worth knowing for he was not only a great electrician, second to Edison alone, but also a beautiful character, modest, unselfish, cheerful; an optimist although a cripple, and marvelously successful although cruelly handicapped by his appearance. But we take notice of him here chiefly for the sake of recording his religious views.

Charles Steinmetz was born in Breslau (Silesia) in 1865 and received his education in that city. When a student at the university there he joined himself, with some of his friends, to the Socialist party. It was the time when Bismarck fought that dangerous political creed with all the powers of the state; to be a Socialist was to be outside the law. Steinmetz had almost finished his university studies, had written a thesis and was about to compete for his doctor's degree when his political actions made it necessary for him to flee the country. He went to Zurich, Switzerland, first; later he emigrated to America, and found in time employment with the General Electric Company. Although he never concealed his political views, he served that capitalistic concern for 30 years, and the General Electric put at his disposal the laboratory where he worked out his epoch-making electrical discoveries, which, in turn, not only enriched the General Electric but mankind as well.

Religiously, Steinmetz was an agnostic. He, apparently, never had much personal religion to lose. His father never went to church. Confirmation, and the instruction preceding it, made no impression on the boy. According to the book, this was in part due to the minister who confirmed him, for he told the boys that educated people might get along without religion, but that religion was a good thing to keep the ignorant multitude in check. Later in life Steinmetz's mind had become so steeped in the methods and view point of science that he could not approach the question of the spiritual side of life in any other way. It was impossible to verify religious data as those of natural science are verified, so he ruled them out of his life. To us that seems a very foolish course; still, a wholly one-sided devotion to scientific pursuits seems frequently to dry up the fountain of spirituality (cp. Darwin, Haeckel, Edison, Burbank). Steinmetz maintained, in his later life,

friendly relations with the Unitarian Church in Schenectady. Membership in that church implied, however, no special creed of any kind, besides, Steinmetz attended only the social affairs of the church, he never joined it.

He took the position that the facts of religion, the things man believes in, such as God, immortality, the soul, can never be based on anything but faith. Logical proof is impossible. The fact that men have always believed in some superior power with which they seek fellowship, to Steinmetz proves only the desire for such contact, not the fact of it. Revelation could not be a reliable source of our faith either, for all religions claim to have revelations. Nor could the historical fruits of Christianity verify its claims to truth. A religion that had been in the world for 2000 years and could not prevent the World War, proved itself by that very fact a failure. The ethical and spiritual teachings of Jesus, although noble as a whole, Steinmetz considered in part not suitable for a world like ours. Christianity left too much to incompetency; it trusted too much to good intentions, aspirations, and so forth, whereas adequate knowledge and proper equipment were necessary.

So we see Steinmetz may have "died as he lived—a simple, wholehearted and devoted servant of humanity"; he never saw a light nor heard a voice from beyond.

"Louder Please!" The Autobiography of a Deaf Man by *Earnest Elmo Calkins.* The Atlantic Monthly Press, Boston, 1924, 260 pages.

It seems unnecessary to offer an apology for including in our "Book Review" another biography even if the topic of religion receives only incidental mention in it. If the biography is well written and the inspiration of difficulties or handicaps nobly overcome is in it, the book is worth reading. Both of these requirements are well met in this volume. Earnest E. Calkins was hard of hearing, almost deaf, from an early age, but he learned to cope with this disadvantage; and he is an exceedingly interesting writer.

Born in a little village and "deafened" by the time he went to school —the ailment seems to have been hereditary in the family—his life might have become one that required no biographers. His Latin teacher, a woman of rare sympathy and helpfulness, however, kindled the spark of ambition in him. She took particular pains with him, saying: "Earnest, I want you to succeed, not in spite of your deafness, but on account of it." He never forgot that teacher and held her in grateful remembrance through life. He passed through high school and even the local college, although what he actually learned in these institutions was little. Fortunately, he early acquired a love of books and so added to his stock of information, also finding in them a world where deafness was no bar to access.

In the little plant of the local paper he learned the art of printing, specializing, in a small way, in the line of advertising. An advertisement of his for the Bissel carpet sweeper attracted wide attention.

Moving to New York, he passed through severe disappointments, his deafness and lack of self-confidence disqualifying him in the competitive struggle of the business world.

The tide turned when he became associated with Ralph Holden, a young, enterprising man of great talent for business and with boundless faith in himself. They founded a small advertising business and Calkin's natural gifts along that line soon began to blossom forth. He knew how to employ art, the characters of literature, the rhymes of the nursery, the jingles of common speech, to set off the merits of breakfast foods, horse feeds, and any other article of trade.

Nevertheless, not having sufficient working capital, the young firm failed. Undaunted, they built again on the ruins, and finally succeeded.

Not the least interesting chapters are those in which the author tells how he learned to adapt himself to a world from which his handicap so remorselessly shut him out. He tried at first to ignore his deafness and to keep in touch with his environment on even terms, as it were. But finding that his efforts were unsuccessful he resigned himself to his fate and let go what he could not maintain. Lip reading and electrical hearing devices were a great help, and his wife was in many ways a patient and intelligent interpreter between him and the outside world. Still, conversation, the theater, lectures, music, being read aloud to were put in the index expurgatorious, as he calls it. On the other hand, he had left books, pictures, art, scenery, travel, games, hobbies. So with many of the other deaf ones, such as Kitto, Thomas Edison, E. S. Martin (the editor of "Life"), Beethoven, Sir Joshua Reynolds, and Rauschenbusch (whom he strangely forgets to mention), Calkins has found life interesting and has made his own contributions to it.

As he says in closing: "Thus I find myself at fifty-four busy and happy, with a very satisfactory "expectancy" allowed by my insurance company, with a life packed full of the most exciting and enthralling things to do, and wondering whether I am going to have time, even if I realize that expectancy, to do them all."

He who reads this book without a growing admiration for the pluck of the man so ungraciously treated by nature, and without a heightened sense of obligation for himself, has read it poorly indeed.

Christianity in Science, by *Fred D. Leete.* The Abingdon Press, 1928. 387 pages, $3.00.

The author, having felt an early admiration for scientific researches and for the chief personalities who have conducted them, has kept in touch all his life with the men, the methods, and the achievements of science. He has never considered it necessary that there should be a conflict between religion and science. Nor should there be an attempt to "reconcile" them for that would of necessity lead to a compromise, doing violence to both. They are both different ways of finding the truth, and there ought to be no interference of the one with the other. Nevertheless there can be interaction between them, to the

benefit of either. The list of Christian men who have done distinguished service in science is large; and, on the other hand, the contribution of science to the welfare of man, to his enlightenment, to the better understanding of itself is inestimable. It is along this line that the writer pursues his course. The achievement of Christian men in science and their testimonies to the truth and helpfulness of religion, constitute the greater part of the book. His outlook is rather optimistic; too optimistic, some would say. Still, he makes out a strong case, and after listening to so much disquieting argument from the skeptics, a strong dose of optimism might restore our mental balance.

The writer gives an instructive survey of the march of science through the centuries; incidentally, of the long continued neglect of its study in our American educational institutions. It was in 1825 that the Liebig laboratory in Germany began to attract foreigners to that country. Since then, what a wonderful change has come about! Science is in the throne everywhere.

The first object of pure science is to extend the boundaries of knowledge; but its second purpose, to adapt such knowledge to useful ends. The basic discoveries of the pure scientist make possible the many inventions that play such an important role in the service of humanity. Some think that the "logic of science," its trend and tendency, is away from God. An opposite interpretation is, however, just as possible. Every new discovery adds to the sense of wonder and mystery. The studies of the constitution of matter suggest that not matter but force controls the universe. The world around us is alive, not dead; it is developing, not static. The writer comes to the conclusion, that "in its profound meaning and testimony science is more Christian than in any former period of history. Religious certainty may be more easily and fully attained in our day than formerly."

Many are afraid of science because it might compel them to give up what they consider as truth. A vain fear. Truth can be only one. There are different ways of finding truth: observation, speculation, intuition, revelation, faith. It is impossible for science to find God; we grasp him only by faith. Neither can science take from us our faith in God. Science may be welcomed as an associate. It can not assume the function of an expert or dictator in the metaphysical or religious field.

A beautiful chapter is devoted to the characters of Christian men of science; and to the martyrs of science, showing that in their devotion to their ideals they showed a consecration equal to the martyrs of the faith. A life spent in harmony with scientific teaching would be one of a higher order, so the writer thinks.

What is the present situation? According to our author, the science of today is not mainly atheistic. But if it were, faith in a deity is not decided by vote. Still, it is heartening to hear men who are leaders in scientific labors, add their own testimony in corroboration of theistic belief. Many voices are quoted.

The last chapter is on immortality. Many interesting expressions on this subject are given from men who are unprejudiced. Their opinions are not uniform nor are they decisive. They like to leave the door open at least. With Cicero, they would rather be wrong with Plato than right with those who deny immortality.

The book is well written, highly interesting, and a wonderful help to those engaged in Christian apologetics. It would be hard to find another from which one could gather illustrations and quotations on the relation between science and religion so fully and so dependably.

My Idea of God. A Symposium of Faith edited by *Joseph Fort Newton*. Boston, Little, Brown and Co., 1926. 286 pages.

"Today there is but one religious dogma in debate: What do you mean by God? And in this respect today is like all the yesterdays. This is the fundamental religious dogma," says A. N. Whitehead in "Religion in the Making." To help men in their thinking about the Reality which gives worth and meaning to life is the purpose of the symposium here arranged. Jew and Gentile, Catholic and Protestant, Modernist and Fundamentalist, Christian Scientist and Quaker, Culturist, Humanist, Empiricist and Mystic tell us in what terms they think of God.

The procession opens with a paper by *Rabbi Enelow*, of Temple Emanu-el, New York City. He gives us the Jewish idea of God, according to which two qualities are essential in the deity: universality (God not limited by place) and holiness. In his holiness are implied love and justice. Those who worship such a God will become like him, their lives will show the same ethical nature. The Rabbi claims that the Jews have suffered for their God-idea through the centuries. "For thy sake have we been slain all the day." A somewhat broad statement, we should say.

John Gresham Machen, the Fundamentalist, and *B. L. Conway*, of the Paulist Fathers (Catholic), show a remarkable agreement in their idea of God. They state that God can be known from nature and the conscience, but that this rather dim light needs to be supplemented by revelation. Machen fires some hot shots at the Pragmatists who teach that all our religious affirmations are value-judgments, not judgments of scientific facts. The most radical position is held by *John H. Dietrich*, formerly of the Reformed Church, now pastor of the Unitarian Society of Minneapolis. He says, the figure of the Christian God, like that of the rest, is a product of the imagination. God is not a creator, for since evolution came creation has gone. He is not a ruler. As we have no use for kings any more, so we have not for a heavenly potentate. "In this age of democracy, to think of God as a king is nothing short of ridiculous." God is not a father. The laws of nature operate without respect to human life and welfare. We have to give up the idea of a sheltering and beneficent parent beyond the natural word.

The God-idea is embodied, not in an idealized individual outside of the world, but in an *idealized people* in the world. In man the power which at first was an unconscious impulse has assumed the proportions (sic) of consciousness, and now the destiny of humanity lies entirely in our hands. Humanity is the object of our religious aspiration. Whether or not there is any supreme mind behind the collective influence of mankind, that collective influence is there and controls my destiny.

The religious view of the writer (the same as Spencer's worship of the Universe, or Aug. Comte's worship of humanity) does *not wholly* convince him intellectually, he says. Still, that God and man together, in fact the same, are toiling and sacrificing for the perfect end, this is the picture he likes to hold in his mind.

Prof. E. S. Ames's (of the university of Chicago) idea of God is that of the personified, idealized whole of reality. God is the common will, the spirit of mankind. He is seen in men, especially in their benevolent, corporate life. God is therefore growing and finite. It is all right to personify the idea of God if we keep in mind that this is imaginative and poetical.

Ames's idea of God enhances for him a sense of friendliness in the universe. He gets sometimes the "sense of presence" which Wordsworth felt; on the whole his view seems largely that of Dietrich.

There are in all eighteen essays on the subject. Some of them reveal plainly the difficulty that many feel of retaining the idea of the loving father in the face of so much to the contrary in our experience. The doctrine of the providence that is involved in this is one of the hardest to maintain in modern life. It is an important part of the Christian faith, and we do not know that there is anything better to say for it today than what satisfied Paul in his time (Rom. 8: 28ff).

"Should Such a Faith Offend?" Sermons and Addresses by *Ernest William Barnes*, Bishop of Birmingham. Hoddes and Stoughton, London, 1928. 331 pages.

The faith here presented and which in the author's opinion "should not offend," is the faith reconciled with science. The bishop is a convinced believer in the theory of evolution. Man sprang from an apelike stock. He has been in the making for something like a million years. We cannot explain how human consciousness, the moral sense and religious belief developed within the animal existence, just as we cannot explain the transition from the inanimate to the animate. But we cannot admit any miraculous interventions in the natural order. The dualism of a natural and a supernatural sphere is a conception that the mind schooled in science has abandoned.

If man is thus a product of biological evolution the stories of Genesis, of the creation of Adam and Eve, the fall of man and his resulting corruption, and Paul's application of it in his theology of redemption, will of course have to go. Still the evolutionary theory does not affect

the main fabric of Christian belief. For back of the evolutionary process is God, his creative spirit. It is impossible to rule out from the cosmic order the idea of design.

The emergence of the ideals of beauty, truth and righteousness cannot have been the result of the working of blind forces. They give content to what is highest in life, i. e., personality, and they will not be satisfied with anything less than a spiritual interpretation of the universe.

Man feels in himself the urge towards moral betterment, the aspiration towards perfection. God has given him Christ to stimulate and satisfy this need. Christ is the perfect man. He is supremely God-conscious, entirely consecrated to his task, a lover of men. His cross is the highest manifestation of his love and of divine love. The incarnation means, according to the author, that the divine life was lived under human conditions; that God reconciled us to himself in Christ means that he placed Jesus before us as our example.

The resurrection and ascension are ignored. They belong, with the miracles, in that sphere which the modern man of science may not enter.

With great enthusiasm and before all kind of audiences, learned and unlearned, the bishop dispenses the new wine of the evolutionary gospel. He can apparently count on the general consensus of the scholars in his country. So this part of the book, and of his faith may not "offend" so much.

However, with equal ardor he attacks the "Sacramentalists" in the Church of England. He is one of the most determined foes of the Catholic movement in that body. In a chapter on the Eucharist he seeks to show that their magical view of the sacrament does not rest on scripture precedent. He admits that in deed very easily such a conception of the sacrament crept into the primitive church, owing to the influence of the pagan "mystery religions"; and that eventually it led to the doctrine of transubstantiation, which was one of the main sources of later priestly despotism. Such perversion of the sacramental idea was corrected by the Reformation and the right use taught and incorporated in the 39 articles, the authoritative symbolical book of the Church of England. The present Anglo-Catholic movement is, therefore, a relapse into Romanism and paganism.

The book is good to read throughout. We are glad to hear at least one episcopal voice raised in protest to the Catholicizing tendencies in the English church; but it seems that while the bishop is perhaps Protestant enough in this respect, in others he does not hold to the full gospel of the Protestant Reformation.

Beliefs that Matter. A Theology for Laymen by *W. A. Brown*, Ph.D., D.D. Chas Scribner's Sons, 1928. 333 pages, $2.75.

For many years the demand has been for an undogmatic Christianity, for a creedless religion. The author, himself belonging to the

Liberal school, from which this demand has gone out, is nevertheless not in favor of discarding the creeds. He knows there are beliefs that matter; that influence conduct, inspire effort, hold out visions. But beliefs are many and there is great disagreement as to their nature and value. What is the criterion whereby we can determine their present importance? Beliefs which affect our moral life, meet basic human needs, have power to console as well as to renew, will be indispensable to the man of today as they were to the fathers of yesterday. It is the test of experience, then, that has to be applied, but the experience of groups and of the leaders of groups, not individual experience only.

With this method to guide him, the writer now undertakes a "spiritual exploration" (H. E. Fosdick) to discover what to believe about oneself, the world, Christ, God, the church, the sacraments, immortality. He takes up one subject after another, states what the creeds or theology used to teach about it, and then "reinterprets" it. It is his constant endeavor to hold to the substance of the old faith, not to give up anything essential; but to clothe it in modern terms. While some of the old school claim that Modernists and Fundamentalists have different religions and are therefore poles apart, this writer seeks to show that his own (modern) interpretation allows him to see in the Fundamentalist a Christian brother, divided from him in theological position, but one in spirit.

To Jesus this world is of value because of the divine purpose to make it subject to God's rule, to establish in it his Kingdom. And human life finds its true content as it is put in the service of this all-inclusive ideal. Surrender to the will of God, by a specific conversion or a gradual growth of spiritual development, leads to freedom and happiness. The evil in the world presents a problem to faith too difficult for solution; still we see it often used as an instrument for good and so can wait until the veils are all drawn away.

The question, what think ye of Christ? is of perrennial recurrence. The church has in the past deposited its answer in the creeds. They are cast in the thought-forms of the ape in which they were formulated, and since there is progress in our knowledge of the world and of history; since the needs and problems of one age are not the same as those of past periods, they will have to be adjusted, revised and restated from time to time. There is no changeless creed in a changing world. Yet the personality of Jesus, however much the critic may differ from the conservative, maintains its unique attractiveness; every age pays homage to its undying glory. Today, as in the time of the apostles, we believe in the incarnation, meaning thereby that he is the ideal for humanity. We believe in his deity, i.e., that he reveals God, that God is like Jesus. We believe in him as Christ and as Saviour, meaning that he reveals God's will for society. And he does not only reveal God and his Kingdom: he makes its realization possible in the individual and in the race.

This our faith in Jesus rests not only on the testimony of the Bible and the church of the past. It is based on his present continuing power over the hearts and lives of men. Because of this we see in him more than a standard for our conduct; he is to us the object of our faith.

The cross of Christ is to the author the culmination of his career. He explains it by saying that it is God's method of overcoming sin by a love that shares. The atonement wrought on the cross is not something that happens to God but something that happens in him. It is the revelation to humanity of the heart of God. "In the cross we see God entering into human experience, taking upon himself the burden of our sin, identifying himself with its consequences in sorrow and shame, so that by his revelation of a love that anticipates repentance, he may win us to the better life." In the cross the father suffers even as the son. In the cross Jesus also summons his followers to the sacrificial life.

Of the mystery of the Trinity the writer says only that as the father God creates the world of man; that in the son he gives us a full revelation of himself and helps us to come into fellowship with him; that by his spirit he maintains the life of the individual and of his church and makes his church an agency for the establishment of his Kingdom.

The last four chapters of the book are on the church; the bible; the sacraments, and immortality. In commenting on these timely subjects, the author does full justice to the views of orthodox as to those on the other side. As in the rest of the book, he occupies a position on the right wing of modern theology. The leading principle is the pragmatic one of the test by experience; or, expresed in another way, he makes "the living church the interpreter of the new meanings in the old gospel."

It is not necessary for us to point out where we differ from him; we have done this time without number in these pages when discussing the modern theological output. We will not hesitate though to express our great appreciation of the book. Its subject is of such importance; its spirit so reverent and conciliating; its interest in vital religious life so pronounced that it deserves careful perusal by every one who seeks to have a reason for the faith that is in him.

Kalvinismus und Luthertum im Zeitalter der Orthodoxie von Lic. theol. Dr. phil. Hans Leube, Privatdozent der Kirchengeschichte an der Universität Leipzig. 1. Band: **Der Kampf um die Herrschaft im protestantischen Deutschland.** A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Leipzig. 402 S., geh. Mk. 18, geb. Mk. 20.

Die Einigungsbestrebungen im Protestantismus haben wieder das Auge für die Eigentümlichkeiten jeder einzelnen Gemeinschaft geschärft, wenn auch die religiösen Unterschiede nicht mehr Gegenstand engherziger Polemik sind. Man fragt, ob der Verlust der religiösen Einheit im Protestantismus eine Folge des Starrsinns einzelner Theologen, oder eine innere Notwendigkeit war.

Wer in der Union aufgewachsen ist, wird diese Frage anders beantworten als der, der etwa heute noch Glied einer streng-lutherischen Kirche ist. Weithin herrscht der Glaube vor, daß die lutherischen Theologen der Streitorthodoxie die Hauptsünder waren, und daß der geistliche Tod in den meisten lutherischen Kirchen des modernen Deutschlands als eine direkte Folge der Ueberschätzung der reinen Lehre auf Kosten des christlichen Lebens anzusehen sei. Auch seien Friedensbestrebungen zwischen den evangelischen Kirchen stets von den Reformierten ausgegangen und nie von den Lutherischen.

Verfasser widmet diese Schrift der Aufklärung dieses Problems. In diesem ersten Band behandelt er den Kampf der beiden Konfessionen um die Herrschaft im protestantischen Deutschland. Er ist hauptsächlich der Besprechung der **reformierten Friedensbestrebungen** gewidmet. Verfasser findet, daß diese Bestrebungen meist politischen Ursachen ihre Entstehung verdankten: dem Anwachsen der katholischen Gefahr, dem Einfluß auswärtiger Mächte wie Holland und England; daß ferner bei den Reformierten der berechnende Verstand mehr mitspielte als der religiöse Glaube, daß sie mehr den Geist des Humanismus als den des Evangeliums in sich pflegten. Eine besonders eingehende und hoch interessante Behandlung findet hier das Beispiel des Brandenburgischen Herrscherhauses, insonderheit des Johann Sigismund, der i. J. 1613 vom Luthertum zum Kalvinismus übertrat. Es wird gezeigt, daß politische Rücksichten, wie sein Bündnis mit Holland und England und die Interessen seiner weit verzettelten Länder ihn zu diesem Schritt veranlaßten, daß auch ferner bei dem Kurfürsten wie bei andern Friedensmittlern gehässige Ausfälle gegen die Lutherischen nicht fehlen. Dies Programm des Kurfürsten war also mehr ein Ergebnis weiser Politik als hervorragender Frömmigkeit.

Die Ausführungen des Verfassers scheinen uns in keiner Weise das Verdienst des Kurfürsten zu verringern. Aeußere Verhältnisse haben in der Tat seine Politik bestimmt, aber da der Fanatismus der Theologen beider Konfessionen bis ans Ende der Periode sich gleich blieb, so war es der Politik vorbehalten, der „rabies theologorum" zu steuern.

Das letzte Kapitel handelt von der Unionsidee des Calixt von der Universität Helmstedt in Braunschweig. Calixt und seine Universität standen außerhalb des Luthertums der Konkordienformel. Er fand seine Lebensaufgabe darin, an einer Einigung der ganzen Kirche, besonders aber des Protestantismus, zu arbeiten auf Grund der Schrift und der ökumenischen Bekenntnisse. Man sieht darin den Einfluß der englischen Kirche, mit der C.

durch einen längeren Besuch in England enge Beziehungen angeknüpft hatte. Das, was diese alten Bekenntnisse gemeinsam hatten, sollte der eiserne Bestand der Theologie werden und bleiben (Traditionalismus). Die Bestrebungen Calixts führen zu keinem dauernden Resultat. Sie würden jede Entwicklung in der Lehre verhindert haben; außerdem standen sie dem reformatorischen Prinzip der Schriftautorität entgegen.

Das Buch zeigt von allseitiger Beherrschung des einschlägigen Stoffes. Die Berücksichtigung auswärtiger Politik, Theologie und Erbauungsliteratur in ihrem Einfluß auf die religiöse Lage in Deutschland scheint uns ein besonderes Verdienst des Werkes zu sein. Die Darstellung des an sich trockenen Stoffes fesselt das Interesse ungemein durch flüssigen Stil und lebendige Schilderung. Man merkt, man hat es mit einer tüchtigen Kraft zu tun, und wir wünschen dem Band und seiner Fortsetzung besten Erfolg und weite Verbreitung.

Das Problem des Wortes. Zur Einleitung in eine Theologie von **Lic. Dr. W. Vollrath,** a. o. Professor der systematischen Theologie. Gütersloh, 1925. C. Bertelsmann-Verlag. 274 S. M. 6.25.

„Das Wort hat die Kirche geschaffen, und das Wort muß sie auch erhalten," sagt Luther. Im Protestantismus wenigstens hat das Wort zentrale Stellung. Darum ist eine klare Auffassung von der Bedeutung des Wortes ein Grundproblem für die theologische Arbeit. Am Wort erzeugt sich der Glaube, am Wort nährt und stärkt er sich in den Anfechtungen des Lebens. Das Wort ist längst da vor der theologischen Besinnung. Dennoch hat sich die theologische Zunft oft gebärdet, als müsse sie das Wort vom Ueberschreiten gebührender Grenzen abhalten. Die Epigonen der Nachreformationszeit glaubten an die Verbalinspiration, doch ihnen war die Schrift Lehre und der Glaube Zustimmung zu dem Lehrgehalt. Als dann die Kritik einsetzte, wurde das Schriftwort in den Händen der Philologen und Historiker seines Offenbarungscharakters entkleidet. Die „positive" Theologie unsrer Tage hat wieder ein Auge für das Göttliche und Bleibende in der Schrift, doch zu einer voll befriedigenden wissenschaftlichen Formulierung ihrer Stellung in Glaube und Kirche ist sie noch nicht gelangt. Verfasser läßt die Theologen dieserhalb Revue passieren: Schleiermacher, die Erlanger, Ihmels, Kaehler, Schlatter, Schaeder, Heim, Barth, Brunner, Gogarten, C. Stange, P. Althaus und findet, daß sie alle hier ein Manko aufweisen. Er geht nun daran, zu dieser noch ungelösten Aufgabe an seinem Teil einen Beitrag zu liefern.

Nach ihm ist die Religion Leben und **Leben ist Verhältnis.** In der Religion handelt es sich um ein Ich und Du, ein Verhältnis zwischen Gott und Mensch. Die neuere Theologie versucht sich zwar viel in der psychologischen Analyse der Religion. Sie legt den Ton darauf, daß Religion **Erlebnis** ist. Sie macht dabei aber die Religion wesentlich zu einem Vorgang im Innenleben des Menschen, zu einer seelischen Bewegung, die irgendwie durch Nachdenken oder einen äußeren Reiz („stimulus") erregt ist, bei der es sich aber nicht um ein wirkliches Verhältnis zwischen Gott und Seele handelt. Vielleicht denkt der religiös erregte Mensch, es sei wirklich ein göttliches Ich, das zu seinem Du redet. Aber das ist nur eine Projektion unsrer Empfindungen auf ein von uns unabhängiges Subjekt.

Dem gegenüber tritt Verfasser stark für die Wirklichkeit des religiösen Verhältnisses, für die Tatsächlichkeit der Gemeinschaft zwischen zwei Faktoren ein. Jenes bloße Erleben möge eine **Lyrik** des Gefühlslebens hervorrufen, bei wahrer Religion handle es sich aber um **Dramatik,** um ein Verhältnis aktiven Einflusses, resp. Beeinflußtwerdens. Wie aber läßt sich dies beweisen? Verfasser scheint uns dieser Frage zu wenig Berücksichtigung zu schenken. Er erinnert uns an den andern Biblizisten, H. Cremer, von dem man auch zu sagen pflegte, er behaupte bloß, aber beweise nicht. Jedoch scheint Verfasser mit Ihmels übereinzustimmen, wenn derselbe sagt, christliche **Gewißheit** gebe es nur in der **Synthese von Wort** (Schrift) **und Erfahrung.**

Das Mittel jenes religiösen Verhältnisses ist das Wort. Das Wort schafft Gemeinschaft zwischen dem, der es liest, hört und dem, der in demselben zu ihm redet, in Trost, Warnung, Verheißung, oder Selbstzeugnis. „In seiner Verhältnis stiftenden Potenz liegt die Bedeutung des Wortes." Das Wort ist die Quelle unsrer religiösen Erkenntnis, nicht nur der Eigenschaften Gottes, sondern auch der religiösen Begriffe der Sünde, Versöhnung, Vergebung. Sie ist auch die Quelle der christlichen Ethik, die sich ganz gründet auf die Tatsache, daß Gott die Kraft gibt zu dem, was er von uns fordert. Verfasser betont stark, daß es in der christlichen Religion um **Tatsachen,** Heilstatsachen geht und begegnet dem Einwand, Tatsachen dieser Art seien doch eine Sache der Vergangenheit, die man bloß als ein Stück Ueberlieferung annehmen könne. Was für eine Bedeutung können Dinge der Vergangenheit für den Glauben haben? Hier weist er auf Kaehler hin und seiner Betonung des „Uebergeschichtlichen." Die Bibel überliefert uns freilich Tatsachen, die in der Vergangenheit geschehen sind, aber indem wir mit ihnen bekannt werden, treten wir in Beziehung, in lebendige Gemeinschaft mit dem „übergeschichtlichen." d. i. ewigen Gott, und in uns wird Glaube geweckt; denn die Schrift ist nicht nur bloß Urkunde des damals Geschehenen, sondern zugleich, vermöge ihres Geistcharakters, eine Urkunde, die **Glauben hervorruft.**

Die Mystik, die heute so populär ist, weist Verfasser ganz ab. Sie ist keine Religion. Sie ist Verschmelzung zur Einheit, nicht mehr Verhältnis zwischen zweien. Sie ist wortlos, verschwommen, Schweigen, nicht aber Wortverkehr.

Verfasser redet trefflich über die Schrift und ihre Bedeutung für die Entwicklung eines reif und selbständig werdenden Glaubens, für die Pflege religiöser Gemeinschaft und für die Erhaltung des Wortes im Wechsel der Zeiten. „Das Neue Testament stellt die Beziehung dar, die der Apostel zur Gemeinde hat und zum erhöhten Herrn. Aus diesem konkreten Beziehungsleben ist ein Beweis zu führen für die Inspiration der Schrift. Er besteht ganz einfach in dem Nachweis, daß und wie sie Wort des Lebens ist." Also man **beschreibe,** was Christ sein im Neuen Testament ist, und die Arbeit ist getan. Wer sich dann nicht überzeugt fühlt, dem ist nicht beizukommen.

Wir finden uns mit dem Verfasser in seiner allgemeinen Einschätzung der Schrift in voller Uebereinstimmung. Er deckt eine Fülle der Beziehungen im „Worte" auf, die seinen Reichtum, seine Zuverlässigkeit und seine Unentbehrlichkeit ins hellste Licht stellen.

Nachspiel. Eine Aussprache mit den Freunden und Kritikern des „Jahrhunderts der Kirche." Von D. **Dr. Otto Dibelius,** Generalsuperintendent der Kurmark. Furche-Verlag, Belin, 1928. 113 S.

Das „Jahrhundert der Kirche" von Dr. O. Dibelius ist von uns im Maiheft 1927 (S. 234 ff.) besprochen worden. In diesem Buch versuchte der Verfasser zu zeigen, daß die Revolution vom 9. November 1918, indem sie der preußischen Landeskirche den Summepiskopat nahm, ihr einen ungewollten Dienst leistete. Sie zwang sie, sich völlig unabhängig vom Staat zu organisieren. Das überraschende Resultat war, daß man in Preußen seitdem eine wirkliche evangelische Kirche hatte, während sie vorher mehr ein Anhängsel des Staats gewesen war. Die Kirche hat bei dieser Schaffung eines allumfassenden Organismus mehr Lebenskraft gezeigt, als selbst ihre Freunde — von den Feinden ganz zu geschweigen — gedacht hatten. Dibelius, von der Begeisterung eines überzeugten Kirchenmanns getragen, hatte dieser nunmehr von Fesseln freien Kirche die größten Entwicklungsmöglichkeiten zugesprochen. Er sprach die Zuversicht aus, daß man allem Anschein nach geradezu einem „Jahrhundert der Kirche" entgegensehen dürfe.

Das Buch ist außerordentlich schlagkräftig gewesen. In kurzer Zeit waren fünf Neudrucke nötig. Neben vielfacher Zustimmung hat es auch nicht an Kritik gefehlt. Die liberal-theologischen Kreise verhielten sich ablehnend. Bei dieser Gruppe waltet gewöhnlich der Standpunkt ob, daß, je reicher und selbständiger ein Christenmensch werde, er um so mehr sich von der Kirche emanzipiere. Die Kirche ist solchen eine religiöse Kleinkinderanstalt; für Erwachsene allenfalls ein notwendiges Uebel; für Theologen nur zu tragen, wenn in ihr eine liberale Oberbehörde die Freiheit aller „Richtungen" garantiert.

Aber auch die Reformierten des Westens erheben Einspruch. Sie sehen das Heil in der presbyterialen Verfassung. Dieselbe ist im Osten noch nicht bodenständig. Ohne sie können sich die Reformierten eine gedeihliche Entwicklung nicht denken.

In dem vorliegenden Büchlein setzt sich Dibelius mit all diesen und andern Einwendungen auseinander. Nach ihm ist die Revolution vom 9. November 1918, die an und für sich verwerflich war, das göttliche Werkzeug gewesen, die Kräfte der Kirche zu entbinden. Die Geschicke haben es so gelenkt, daß nun eine Kirche da ist, die die sittliche und religiöse Erziehung des Volks in die Hand nehmen kann; und auf denen, die durch Geburt und Erziehung in dieser Kirche aufgewachsen sind, ruht die unabweisliche **Verantwortlichkeit,** zu dieser Kirche zu stehen und ihr ihre volle Mitwirkung zu geben. Diese Verantwortung ist um so größer, als der Staat selbst religionslos geworden ist, von ihm also sittliche und religiöse Pflege nicht erwartet werden kann. Leider ist es das Erbübel des Deutschen, daß es bei ihm vor lauter Kritik nie zum Handeln kommt, daß er aus der „Problematik" sich nicht herausfinden kann. Aber wozu dient es, im Hader über theologische Fragen oder solche der Verfassung sich zu entzweien? Ist es nicht besser, die Kirche zu nehmen wie sie ist und in ihr aufbauende Arbeit zu tun. Die Kirche ist dazu da, das Reich Gottes bauen zu helfen. Sie ist dazu da, die „Gesinnungen des Gottesreichs zu verwirklichen," wie solche in die Welt in Jesu, dem Auferstandenen, durchschlagend und grundlegend in dies Erdenleben eingetreten sind. Diese Aufgabe, die Gesinnungen des Gottes-

reiches und damit das Gottesreich selbst zu verwirklichen, kann nur die Aufgabe einer Gemeinschaft sein, nicht einzelner. Die äußere Gemeinschaft nach den Worten des Neuen Testaments zu formen geht nicht an — solche Worte sind nicht da. Demnach nehme man sie, wie sie ist, in der Zuversicht, daß sie nicht ohne Gottes Fügung so geworden ist.

Zu diesen Ausführungen werden wir, die wir von der Freikirche oder aus dem Pietismus kommen, manche Randbemerkung machen. Wir werden sagen: Wie kann einer die Kirche bauen helfen, ohne die geistlichen Qualifikationen zu haben?

Und die Reformierten werden ihr Gemeinde- und Kirchenideal nicht als „presbyteriale Romantik" zum alten Eisen werfen. Sie können in der Tat darauf hinweisen, daß innerhalb der reformierten Kirche gerade die Kirchlichkeit leben geblieben ist, während in den lutherischen Landen, Freistaat Sachsen, Provinz Sachsen, Thüringen, Braunschweig, Mecklenburg usw. der Tod im Topfe ist. Woran liegt das? Doch gewiß daran, daß die lutherische Kirche es nicht verstanden hat, die Gemeinde selbst zu Leben und Verantwortlichkeit zu erziehen. Freilich hilft es jetzt auch wenig, im Osten den unkirchlichen Laien durch synodale Verfassung das Mittel zu geben, die Arbeit der Kirche zu sabotieren.

Was aber auch immer unsre Bedenken sind, wir müssen uns vor Augen halten, daß die Kirche drüben nicht Freikirche ist, sondern das ganze Volksleben zu umschließen trachtet. Das hat Nachteile, aber es weitet auch den geistigen Horizont. So wie die Dinge liegen, kämpft Dibelius für eine gute Sache. Wir können nur wünschen, daß seine Arbeit nicht umsonst sei; daß das Gefühl der Verantwortlichkeit weithin geweckt werde. Die Not ist groß, der Kampf ist schwer. Die Kirche bedarf derer, die wie Dibelius zu Rufern zum Streit und Führern im Streit befähigt sind.

Abschließend bemerken wir noch, daß Verfasser auch hier wieder für das Amt des evangelischen **Bischofs** nachdrücklich eintritt. Dem Bischof als geistlichem, lebenslänglichem Führer der Kirche gehört nach ihm die Zukunft.

Grundriß der neutestamentlichen Theologie von **Theodor Zahn**. A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Leipzig, 1928. 132 S., geh. Mk. 4.80, geb. Mk. 6.

In diesem Band fügt der Altmeister Zahn (mehr als 80jährig) seinen zahlreichen Werken über neutestamentliche Exegese und den neutestamentlichen Kanon eine kurzgefaßte Darstellung der neutestamentlichen Theologie hinzu. Er gliedert aber nicht, wie es früher üblich war, diese Disziplin nach den „Lehrbegriffen" der einzelnen Schriftsteller, sondern gibt die Lehre Jesu als ein Ganzes nach allen vier Evangelisten. Es folgt der Lehre der Apostel: 1. Kap. Der Gemeindeglaube der apostolischen Kirche; 2. Kap. Die apostolische Lehre in Israel (Jakobus); 3. Kap. Die Theologie des Paulus; 4. Kap. Der eschatologische Lehrkreis; 5. Kap. Jesus der Hohepriester im Hebräerbrief und der Logosbegriff des Johannes.

Die Darstellung ist gedrängt, aber durchaus deutlich und vollständig. Der Verfasser verfügt über eine unübertroffene Sachkenntnis: ein trotz des Alters des Autors frisch geschriebenes und höchst brauchbares Handbuch für den wichtigen Gegenstand.

Stockholm. Internationale sozial-kirchliche Zeitschrift. Herausgegeben im Auftrag der Internationalen Institutskommission von D. **Adolf Keller,** Genf. Deutscher Schriftleiter Prof. D. A. Titius-Berlin („Editor of the British Section Principal" Alfred E. Garvie, D. D., London; „French Editor," Elie Gounelle, Pasteur-St.-Etienne). 1928. No. 1. Verlag von Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht-Göttingen. $2.50 per Jahr.

Diese neue Zeitschrift, welche das Werk von Stockholm, nämlich die gemeinsame Arbeit der Kirche an der Durchdringung der Weltverhältnisse mit dem Geist Christi, weiterführt, erscheint hiermit zum ersten Mal vor dem Publikum. Es ist eine Quartalschrift, jedesmal 96 Seiten stark, bedient von führenden Männern in den verschiedenen Ländern. Die Artikel sind geschrieben auf deutsch, englisch oder französisch, je nach der Volkszugehörigkeit des Verfassers. Erscheint ein Artikel in deutsch, so wird ein kurzer Auszug in den beiden andern Sprachen gegeben; entsprechend in den andern Fällen. Das vorliegende Heft enthält Artikel von Söderblom, Garvie, Ihmels, Kapler, Ragaz, R. Seeberg, Adolf Keller u. a. Für den sozial und international interessierten Geistlichen ein fast unentbehrliches Hilfsmittel der Information.

Allgemeines Gebetbuch. Herausgegeben im Auftrag der Allgemeinen Evangelisch-Lutherischen Konferenz. Sechste, völlig umgearbeitete Auflage. Leipzig, A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, D. W. Scholl. 1928. 227 Seiten, M. 4.50.

Eine wesentlich verkürzte Herausgabe eines dickleibigen Gebetbuchs vom Jahre 1887 (5. Auflage). Entsprechend der Zeit ist vieles fallen gelassen worden, was im alten war; auch sind alle Gebete kurz gehalten. Das Buch enthält tägliche Morgen- und Abendgebete für zehn Wochen, Gebete fürs Kirchenjahr, für Krankheit, Ehestand usw. Auch die Hauptbekenntnisse, besonders die Augsburgische Konfession, sind beigegeben.

Luther unter vier Päpsten von Ernst Emil Gerten, D. D., Columbus, O., Lutheran Book Concern. 1928. 104 S., 75 Cts.

Das Leben und Wirken Luthers wird hier volkstümlich erzählt in Gestalt von fingierten Gesprächen, die die vier Päpste, unter denen seine Tätigkeit stattfand, mit ihren Kardinälen oder Abgesandten führen. Die vier Päpste sind Leo X. (1513—1521), Hadrian VI. (1521—24), Klemens (1524—34), Paul III. (1534 bis nach dem Tod Luthers). Der Verfasser ist gleichsam gegenwärtig bei diesen Audienzen und teilt in dem Büchlein mit, was die heiligen Väter in Rom über Luther zu sagen haben.

Es folgt dann eine Erörterung über die Augsburgische Konfession und eine Darstellung der Hauptmomente aus Luthers Leben.

Die Schilderung ist höchst anschaulich. Die päpstlichen Aeußerungen sind zwar keine „ipsimina verba"; aber der Zweck, zu zeigen, daß Gott auf Luthers Seite war und jemand anders auf der Päpste Seite, wird zweifellos erreicht. Ein nettes Handbüchlein für Lutherfreunde.

Die Theologie Girgensohns. Umrisse einer christlichen Weltanschauung. Dargestellt von D. **Werner Gruehn,** Privatdocent an der Universität Berlin und an der Universität Dorpat.

Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann, 1927. 132 S., M. 4.20, geb. M. 6.

Wir haben vor einigen Jahren das Hauptwerk Girgensohns, „Der seelische Aufbau des religiösen Lebens" besprochen. In demselben wandelte er auf den Bahnen von W. James, Starbuck und vielen andern amerikanischen Religionspsychologen. Auf dem Weg des psychologischen Experiments sucht er das Wesen und die Art des religiösen Erlebnisses zu erfassen und zur Darstellung zu bringen: in Deutschland eine noch wenig geübte Verfahrungsweise.

Girgensohn war theologischer Professor an der Universität Dorpat und hat dort einen tiefgehenden Einfluß ausgeübt. Als im Jahre 1918 die deutsche Front in Rußland zusammenbrach, war es auch um die deutsche Universität in Dorpat geschehen. G. floh nach Deutschland, fand Anstellung in Greifswald und später in Leipzig. Nach nur kurzer Wirksamkeit an der letzteren Universität starb er im Jahre 1925. Im folgenden Jahre widmete ihm D. L. Ihmels einen Nachruf in der „Allg. Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung": „Die Theologie Girgensohns," der uns aber leider nicht mehr zur Hand ist.

In dem vorliegenden Buch entwirft Prof. Gruehn, ein Schüler und Freund G.s, ein ansprechendes Bild von der vielseitigen Tätigkeit und der theologischen Weltanschauung des Verstorbenen. Girgensohn hatte als Balte das reiche religiöse und kirchliche Erbe jenes Landes überkommen. Doch war er als Jüngling in Zweifel geraten und zeitweilig vom vollen Rationalismus nicht fern gewesen. Nachdem er sich zum Glauben durchgerungen, war es ihm ein Bedürfnis geworden, seinen religiösen Besitz geistig zu verarbeiten und zu einer wissenschaftlich wohl fundierten Lebensanschauung zu gelangen. Und was ihm selbst Bedürfnis geworden, das suchte er als theologischer Lehrer auch andern zu übermitteln. Seine theologische Wissenschaft ruhte auf zwei Pfeilern: 1. auf exakter empirischer Forschung und 2. auf der „pneumatischen" (durch Betrachtung und Gebet) Erforschung der Heiligen Schrift. Es war sein Bestreben, Wissenschaft und Glauben möglichst zu versöhnen, den alten Glaubensgehalt in moderne Denkformen zu fassen. Er vertraute sich in dieser Richtung der Führerschaft seines Lehrers R. Seeberg an, der dies zum Programm der „modern positiven" Schule gemacht hatte.

Die Aufgabe, die sich G. gestellt, war eine sehr umfassende. Eine reiche schriftstellerische Tätigkeit in seiner Heimat legte Zeugnis ab von seinem unermüdlichen Ringen, sich selbst und seiner Zeit zu genügen.

Die Tragik des Zusammenbruchs ergriff ihn bis in die Tiefen. Doch das Mutterland bot ihm Zuflucht, und er vergalt es in fruchtbarer, nur zu kurzer Arbeit. Sein Leib fand seine Ruhestätte in Leipzig nicht weit von dem Grab von W. Wundt, seinem vielbewunderten Lehrer.

Girgensohn ist unter uns nur wenig bekannt. D. Gruehns Buch wird denen, die es lesen, einen Einblick in das reiche Schaffen eines rastlosen Forschers geben.

Postille. Predigtrufe aller Zeiten an unsre Zeit in kurzen Lesungen für Wochen-, Schul- und Hausandachten. Gesammelt von **G. Petersmann-Borsdorff.** Mit einem Geleitwort von Rud. Otto. Gießen, 1927. Verlag von Alfred Toepelmann. 212 Seiten, geh. M. 3, geb. M. 5.

Einer Anregung von Prof. R. Otto Folge gebend, bietet hier die Gattin von Prof. W. Petersmann (seit Oktober in unserm Eden-Seminar wirkend) eine Predigtsammlung ganz eigener Art. Während sonst solche nur die Predigten eines einzigen Predigers oder einer besondern Richtung enthalten, gibt sie uns 90 Predigten von 60 verschiedenen Predigern aller Zeiten und Richtungen, von Chrysostomus und Augustin, bis zu Kierkegaard und Barth, von Berthold von Regensburg bis zu Sadhu Sundar Singh, von M. Luther bis zu Heim und Ihmels. Es tritt also in dem Band die Mannigfaltigkeit des christlichen Zeugnisses und der Reichtum des Glaubenslebens der Kirche stark in die Erscheinung. Es werden nur ausgewählte Einzelstücke aus den Predigten dargeboten, solche, die auch für den Mann von heute noch zugkräftig sind. Infolgedessen sind die Predigten alle nur ganz kurz, etwa zwei Druckseiten.

Was den Gebrauch der Sammlung anbetrifft, so sollen sie außer der Anregung, die sie dem Leser, speziell dem Prediger, liefern, besonders als Material für Lesegottesdienste in der Woche dienen. Für diesen Zweck werden sie in unsern Gemeinden nur selten benutzt werden können. Um so höher aber ist ihr Wert für den Prediger selbst zu schätzen. Die Sammlung zeugt nicht nur von dem immensen Fleiß, mit dem die einzelnen Stücke ausgesucht und in die rechte Form gebracht worden sind, sondern auch von dem hohen Geschick und dem feinen Verständnis, die die Auswahl geleitet haben. Es kann billig bezweifelt werden, ob es irgendwo sonst ein solches Werk gibt, und ebenso kann man sich leicht vorstellen, wie oft der Prediger, in diesem Buche auf die Weite und Höhe des Lebensmeers geführt, einen Zug tun mag.

Der Inhalt gruppiert sich in fünf Abschnitte: Die Festzeit, Anbetung Gottes, Christenleben vor Gott (der Heilsweg), Christenleben in der Welt, Tod und Ewigkeit. Im vierten Abschnitt findet das „Soziale" eingehende Behandlung.

Wir empfehlen das Buch warm, es wird den Deutschpredigenden Genuß und Hilfe reicher Art zuführen.